FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 064 3 April 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Says Thatcher Presents Own Views on SDI [Bogachev] AA 1
West's Reluctance on INF Accord Discussed AA 3
West Fears Deal [Nikanorov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Mar] AA 3
Bogachev on NATO Reaction AA 6
U.S. Sincerity Questioned AA 7
[Shalnev in IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]
3 April Underground Nuclear Test at Semipalatinsk AA 8
TASS Reports U.S. Test of Tomahawk Missile AA 8
Soviet Committee of Physicians Against War Meets AA 8
[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Foreign Ministry Holds News Conference 31 Mar CC 1
Arms Control Issues CC 1
[Gerasimov, Karpov, Chervov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Apr]
Marine Case 'Spy Mania' CC 3
'Regret' Over Arrests in France CC 4
Greek, Turkish Restraint Urged CC 4
CPSU's Shishlin on Foreign Policy Issues [Budapest MAGYARORSZAG Mar] CC 5
Gerasimov Holds News Conference 2 April CC 8
Denies Israeli Envoy Statement CC 8
Reduced Greek-Turkish Tension CC 8
Mongolian Troop Withdrawal [Tokyo KYODO] CC 9
Pakistani Afghan Plane Downing CC 9
Thatcher's Nuclear Arms Stance CC 9
TASS on U.S., NATO Arms Supplies to RSA [Kulik] CC 11
Ryzhkov Sends Greetings to UN ECE Session [PRAVDA 1 Apr] CC 12

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Borin: U.S. 'Neoglobalism' Linked to SDI Plans A 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Apr]
Commentary on Tower Report, 'Soviet Threat' [Radio Peace and Progress] A 2
TASS Cites NSC 'Directive' on Concentration Camps A 3

NORTHEAST ASIA

Correspondent Notes 'Ostentation' in Pyongyang C 1
[Golovachev in TRUD 3 Apr]
MPR General Departs Moscow on Tour of Country C 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Apr]
Japan To Ease Trade Friction With U.S. Through SDI C 2

SOUTH ASIA

IZVESTIYA on Obstacles to DRA Reconciliation D 1
[1 Apr]
Economic Aid to DRA 'Pillar' of Relations D 1
[MOSCOW NEWS 29 Mar]
Western Diplomats Accused of Smuggling DRA Art D 4
[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 24 Mar]

EASTERN EUROPE

Gorbachev Reportedly To Visit CSSR 6-8 April [AFP] F 1
Loginov on Gorbachev Visit [Prague RUDE PRAVO 1 Apr] F 1
Briefs: Hungarian Friendship Society F 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Additional Reportage on Thatcher Official Visit G 1
Thatcher, Sakharov Lunch Talks [London PRESS ASSOCIATION] G 1
Ryzhkov-Thatcher Talks [PRAVDA 2 Apr] G 2
UK Commerce Office Inaugurated [IZVESTIYA 1 Apr] G 3
'Broad' Dialogue With Gorbachev [Druzhinin] G 4
Moscow TV Interviews Thatcher G 5
[Kalyagin, Kolesnichenko, Simonov]
Thatcher 31 Mar Address [PRAVDA 2 Apr] G 15
Space Cooperation Agreement [IZVESTIYA 2 Apr] G 17
Culture, Education Accord [IZVESTIYA 2 Apr] G 19
Invitation for Howe To Visit G 22
Arbatov on Thatcher Arms Stand [London PRESS ASSOCIATION] G 22
'Fabricated' Soviet 'Threat' [Kulik] G 22
Thatcher Moscow Send-Off [IZVESTIYA 2 Apr] G 23
Tours Tbilisi; Dinner; Departs [IZVESTIYA 3 Apr] G 24
Thatcher Remarks on Plane Home [PRAVDA 3 Apr] G 25
Media Comment on Thatcher [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Apr] G 26
UK Press Reaction to Visit [PRAVDA 3 Apr] G 26
Britons Want Missile Solution [Shishkovskiy] G 27
Thatcher Visit Assessed [London PRESS ASSOCIATION] G 28
Parliament Address on Results G 29
Embassy in France Protests 3 Employees' Expulsion G 30
Briefs: French Scientist Decorated; Luxembourg Cultural, G 30
Scientific Cooperation

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Talyzin Addresses PDRY Soviet Collectives H 1
Departs for Moscow H 1
Contracts Open 'New Phase' in Ties With Egypt H 1
[Belyakov in PRAVDA 28 Mar]
Moroccan Politician 'Scorns' Possible U.S. Bases H 1
PRAVDA Notes 'Tripoli Declaration' on PLO Unity H 2
[28 Mar]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

AFP Notes Moscow 'Concerned' by Chad Situation J 1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Comments on Chad Situation J 1
[Vinogradov 2 Apr]

Talyzin Returns From Visit to Mozambique J 2
Mozambique Treaty Anniversary Observance Noted J 3
Leadership Greetings J 3
[PRAVDA 31 Mar]
Officials Address Fete J 4
[PRAVDA 2 Apr]
Gromyko Holds Talks J 4
PRAVDA Notes New Ambassador to Zimbabwe J 5
[25 Mar]

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

TASS Reports Central Committee Politburo Meeting R 1
Luykanov, Others Fill Vacant Supreme Soviet Seats R 3
Zaykov, Yeltsin, Others Address Ideology Course R 4
Supreme Soviet Presidium Meets; Chaired by Gromyko R 5
Makes Decision on Railways R 5
Yakovlev Addresses CPSU Mass Media Conference R 5
[TRUD 1 Apr]
PRAVDA Reviews Nikonov Visit to Murmansk [30 Mar] R 8
PRAVDA UKRAINY on Plenum Leadership Criticism [27 Mar] R 9
PRAVDA Summarizes Latvian Central Committee Plenum [26 Mar] R 11
Information Report on 25 March Belorussian Plenum R 14
[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 26 Mar]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA on Elimination of Economic 'Giantism' S 1
[Parfenov in PRAVDA 26 Mar]
Minister of Geology Views Oil, Gas Prospecting S 6

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

More on Military Education Forum in Kazakhstan V 1
Kiev Field-Rank Officers Dismissed for Abuses V 1
[Polyakov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Mar]

U.S. SAYS THATCHER PRESENTS OWN VIEWS ON SDI

LD011714 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 1 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

A spokesman for the Reagan Administration said in Washington March 31 that, according to the information available to the American side, the British prime minister during her visit to Moscow had set forth with her own variations the stand on SDI that came in line with the U.S. approaches.

These approaches are well-known. In a bid to whitewash its "Star Wars" program, the U.S. administration is interpreting very tendentiously facts concerning the state of the American and Soviet anti-missile defense, distorting the stand of the sides on anti-satellite weapons and simply waving away the plain provisions of the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems under the pretext of its allegiance to "common sense."

"Common sense" which motivates Washington's actions in evaluating the American "Star Was" program is in essence a product of pettyfoggery the purpose of which is to undermine the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems.

For instance, the 1972 agreement prohibits the deployment of a large-scale ABM defense and the testing of anti-satellite weapons in space, whereas Washington's "common sense" permits that. The U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" calls for the breach of virtually every important provision of the ABM treaty. SDI and the ABM treaty are incompatible, mutually exclusive things.

The Reagan Administration spokesmen often emphasize with the air of significance about them that the Soviet Union has an anti-ballistic missile defense around Moscow. What they prefer not to mention, however, clearly aiming for the people with little, if any, knowledge on the matter is that the Soviet defense has been deployed in full compliance with the quantitative and geographical limitations set by Article III of the 1972 treaty.

It is common knowledge that the United States has an anti-missile defense deployed in the area where U.S. offensive missiles are stationed. The fact that the U.S. defense is partially mothballed does not change anything. The difference between a mothballed and an active weapon systems is about the same as between a dollar in his owner's pocket and his dollar deposited in a bank.

The British prime minister maintained that American ABM systems being developed under SDI are non-nuclear, whereas the Soviet anti-missile missiles, as Mrs. Thatcher said contrary to facts, were allegedly equipped with nuclear warheads.

It seems that Washington's "common sense" can take one too far! For the United States is making no secret of the fact that the purpose of a majority of nuclear tests conducted in Nevada is to develop ABM laser systems with nuclear pumping.

The United States, moreover, is the pioneer in the development of anti-satellite systems. Back in the 1960's the Pentagon deployed two anti-satellite systems on Kwajalein Atoll and on Johnston Island in the Pacific.

According to the American magazine BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, for some time those systems were equipped with high-yield nuclear warheads. At present the United States is intensively developing a second generation of anti-satellite systems.

The United States torpedoed the talks on anti-satellite systems and is turning down to this day the Soviet Union's proposals to conclude an agreement with the U.S. -- the agreement that would ban the testing of all anti-satellite weapons, preclude the deployment of new and provide for the destruction of all existing anti-satellite weapons. The United States rejected that proposal.

The Soviet Government decided not to be the first to deploy any anti-satellite systems in space. In other words, the U.S.S.R. instituted a unilateral moratorium on such launches and it will last for as long as other states, the U.S. included, refrain from the emplacement of anti-satellite weapons in outer space.

The stand of the White House in that issue is obstructionist, too.

Washington strategists are pretending that they are gravely concerned over Soviet anti-satellite weapons (of which only one unit exists) -- the unit which, by the way, the Soviet Union is prepared to destroy on the basis of a bilateral agreement with the United States. At the same time the Reagan Administration is confronting the world with the prospect of thousands of U.S. weapons appearing in space -- a factor which would dramatically heighten the threat of an all-out nuclear war that may break out as a result of malfunctions in the warning and communication systems.

Washington is now declaring its readiness to embark on a bilateral reduction of strategic offensive arms on a comparatively limited area of the land surface and at the same time is about to begin the deployment of far more dangerous weapons in truly boundless space.

In such circumstances the link between the reduction of strategic offensive arms and non-deployment of weapons in space is a strategic linkage. The Soviet Union will never agree to undo that package.

Some time back Sir Geoffrey Howe, the British secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs, said that research work (under the SDI program) could gather such momentum that it would be impossible to stop it even if there were serious grounds for trying to do so.

One cannot but agree with this view. At present U.S. research into the development of space strike arms approached a critical line beyond which one will have to decide whether to comply with the 1972 ABM treaty, and in doing so to maintain stability in the world, or to renounce that agreement and open up a road to the militarization of outer space and face a dramatically-grown risk of a nuclear war unfathomable in its disastrous consequences.

WEST'S RELUCTANCE ON INF ACCORD DISCUSSED

West Fears Deal

PM011151 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Mar 87 p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Nikanorov military-political review: "Europe: Dispelling the Clouds of Militarism"]

[Text] A bright ray of hope has broken through the black clouds of militarism which had covered the European horizon, hope that the sinister palisade of nuclear missiles will disappear from the continent in the very near future. The European public, and indeed the entire world public, and the governments of many countries are continuing to discuss the Soviet proposal on the immediate solution of the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe. The Soviet peace initiative is assessed as a unique chance to rid Europe of a substantial proportion of its nuclear load.

The nuclear burden on our common European house is extraordinarily heavy and is continuing to grow. By the end of last year, an official spokesman for the NATO headquarters has stated, there were 316 U.S. medium-range missiles placed on the territory of the United States' West European allies. There are 108 mobile launchers for Pershing-2 nuclear missiles deployed in the FRG. There are 208 U.S. cruise missiles with nuclear warheads sited on the territories of Italy, Britain, Belgium, and the FRG. Under NATO's so-called "two-track decision," by the end of 1988 it is planned to increase the number of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe to 572.

In Western Europe protests are continuing unabated against the U.S. "nuclear umbrella" which is intensifying the threat that the Old World will be turned into a lifeless desert. The new Soviet proposal is aimed at averting precisely this danger. That is acknowledged even by the leading figures of a number of West European countries. Virtually all European capitals are expressing favor in reaching a Soviet-U.S. agreement on eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe. Dutch Prime Minister. Lubbers, for instance, expressed the hope that the previously planned placing of U.S. cruise missiles on his country's territory would not take place inasmuch as the Soviet-U.S. talks would make this step superfluous.

People on the other side of the Atlantic have also expressed favor in achieving positive results at these talks. But how sincere are these statements? You involuntarily ask yourself this when you compare some facts of the past few days. On the one hand eloquent assurances of Washington's readiness to resolve the "Euromissiles" problem constructively and on the other overtly provocative tests on first-strike "Pershing-2" missiles. It is true that they took place on Cape Canaveral (Florida) but they were carried out by servicemen of the 56th U.S. artillery Brigade stationed in the FRG. According to a statement by a spokesman for the testing range, the series of six launches of these missiles at targets several hundred miles away in the Atlantic was aimed at checking the U.S. missile troops' combat readiness. There's no denying that they chose a suitable time for this ostentatious "check."

Here is one more comparison. On the one hand Washington's same old unfounded declarations of its intent to free Europe of medium-range missiles and on the other reports on the start of the placing of U.S. cruise missiles at the second U.S. air base (after Greenham Common) in Britain -- Molesworth in Cambridgeshire. [paragraph continues]

THE GUARDIAN newspaper attests that the U.S. Air Force Command and the British Defense Ministry essentially confirms the fact that the placing of cruise missiles in Molesworth has begun, which is an important new stage in the buildup of the U.S. nuclear arsenal on British soil. The newspaper's military observer, D. Fairhall, explained this rather strange step on the threshold of the Soviet-British talks by the fact that the NATO leaders in fact rule out the possibility of achieving a real "zero option" for medium-range missiles in Europe and therefore they would like to disperse missiles in advance over as large a number of regions as possible.

It looks as though the professional anti-Soviets have needed a month to somehow recover from the shock inflicted on them by the 28 February Soviet initiative on medium-range missiles. To all appearances, all previous opinions of the "zero option" voiced by military policy's smart operators were nothing more than propaganda bluff with which they were counting on retaining their innocence and acquiring nuclear-missile capital. They were gambling on the USSR never agreeing to the "zero option." The ploy failed. And now new "arguments" are hastily being sought in the militarists' camp which could cause the talks to be broken off and prevent the conclusion of a fair agreement on medium-range missiles.

What is at the basis of this panic-stricken fear in the face of a possible agreement? The U.S. newspaper the CHICAGO TRIBUNE recently involuntarily blurted out the answer to this question. Calling the new Soviet initiative "a trap for the United States," it urged that there should be no signing of "even a really fair agreement on intermediate-range nuclear forces with the Soviet Union." The bourgeois newspaper is frightened that such an agreement would lead to the further development of events most contrary to the wishes of certain circles. "Probably," the CHICAGO TRIBUNE writes with unconcealed alarm, "assertions will be heard that since the treaty on intermediate nuclear forces eases tension to such a degree, there is no need to finance the necessary modernization of conventional forces, and with these assertions new actions will be initiated against the strategic defense initiative at home." So that's it. The militarists fear an agreement as the devil fears incense because it will cut the ground from under the champions of the buildup of the arms race and its transfer into space. That is why the United States and NATO are now so frenziedly seeking ploys which could deadlock the talks. Let's name a few of them.

First ploy. They suggest getting rid of all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe but only of some of them. According to the plan of this venture's authors, each side, after the reduction, would be left with 50, or even better 100, missiles on European territory. Yet this indefinite solution, in contrast to the Soviet proposal, will not strengthen European security.

Second ploy. They suggest not eliminating the U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe but re-equipping or resisting them. That is, if an agreement is reached the United States would, by removing the Pershing-2 missiles' second stage, turn them into missiles with a smaller range than the medium-range (Pershing-1 or Pershing-1b) missile while the cruise missiles would be placed on submarines or surface ships. Behind all this lies the desire of Washington and NATO, come what may, to retain the "Euromissiles" as first surprise strike weapons, merely switching the labels on them. Yet the Soviet Union has stated its readiness to eliminate all its medium-range missiles in Europe.

Third ploy. It is proposed to discuss the question of the medium-range missiles only in "linkage" with questions of operational-tactical missiles. Yet the Soviet Union has "extracted" the problem of medium-range missiles from the "Reykjavik package" precisely so that it can be resolved separately without any impediment. [paragraph continues]

What is the point of artificially constructing a new "package?" All the more so since the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's 28 February statement clearly said that as soon as an agreement is signed on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, the USSR will withdraw from the GDR and the CSSR, by agreement with those countries' governments, its enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles. Our country is also prepared to embark immediately on talks aimed at reducing and completely eliminating these missiles.

The ploys complicating a European settlement undoubtedly include expatiations to the effect that, deprived of U.S. medium-range missiles, Western Europe will remain "defenseless" in the face of some "Soviet military predominance."

Yet this "predominance" is only the fruit of inveterate anti-Soviets' idle fantasy. In actual fact, and this is acknowledged by serious researchers in the West, approximate parity exists in conventional armaments between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The Brookings Institution frankly admitted in an item published last year that the "correlation of forces is not only closer to parity but is even in the West's favor." Nor do the arguments about Western Europe's "nuclear defenselessness" without the U.S. "nuclear umbrella" withstand any criticism. Let us recall that the U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles are not the only nuclear weapons on the continent. There are two other nuclear powers belonging to the NATO bloc in Europe -- Britain and France. Although their nuclear potentials have been left out of the present talks, they can by no means be discounted.

The nuclear weapons of both these powers are constantly being improved. The recent successful second testing in the United States of the Trident-2 nuclear missile reminded us that soon these missiles, on each of which will be placed at least 10 warheads with a yield of 150-500 kilotons, will be received by the British Navy. Reports have percolated to the press on painstakingly concealed instances of London's participation in NATO efforts to build up nuclear arsenals. This information acquires a special ring against the background of increasingly frequent talk in Western countries of the need to create some "joint West European defense."

Bonn can claim far from the least role in this "defense."

Security must be equal for all. This is the line adhered to by the USSR and the other socialist community countries following a coordinated foreign policy course. The differences in particular types of armaments existing within the framework of the overall approximate parity between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the socialist countries believe, should be eliminated, aiming at the lowest level. Not building up but reducing armaments while retaining parity at the lowest possible level -- that is the formula for true security.

The decisions of the routine session of the Warsaw Pact states' foreign ministers committee held in Moscow recently fit well into this formula. The documents adopted at the session are imbued with one concern -- to strengthen and preserve peace, to avert the threat of nuclear war hanging over mankind. The speediest conclusion of a medium-range missiles agreement, the session noted, would open the way to Europe's full liberation from nuclear weapons. Every state in the continent can make a worthy contribution to this noble cause. Preventing the ray of hope which has brightly illumined the sky over Europe from being extinguished and clearing the cradle of human civilization of nuclear weapons -- that is the urgent requirement of the times.

Bogachev on NATO Reaction

LD312019 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS -- by Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military writer

World public opinion welcomed the Soviet Union's initiative which calls, among other things, for singling out the problem of medium-range missiles from the package of other issues and for an undelayed conclusion of a separate agreement on the complete elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe and their radical reduction -- down to 100 warheads -- on a global scale.

The Soviet Union made the move in order to give a new impetus to the process of arms limitation and reduction and to set in motion the talks on nuclear and space arms at Geneva.

The leaders of the NATO countries also reacted positively to the proposals -- in words. They acknowledged that efforts to resolve the issue of medium range missiles separately came in line with the list of priorities in the stage-by-stage approach to arms control.

However, as was the case on more than one occasion in the past, in reaction to a realistic prospect for concluding a Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of considerable numbers of nuclear weapons, the first such agreement between the two countries in the past seven years, they began looking for pretexts both to impede that process and to try and gain unilateral military advantages.

While welcoming the undoing of a package by the Soviet Union and the separation of medium-range missiles from it, Western politicians at once proposed their own versions of new NATO packages that would seriously complicate the task of early solution of the issue of medium-range missiles. The things went so far that instead of reducing nuclear arsenals in Europe NATO countries want to embark on their buildup, on the "rearmament" with U.S. theater missiles.

On the one hand, NATO leaders propose to link the elimination of medium-range weapons with the simultaneous solution to the issue of theater missiles, with chemical weapons, with conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe. But didn't the countries of the socialist community table the corresponding proposals long ago -- the proposals the realization of which would drastically lower the level of military confrontation without causing damage to national security of any country?

By the way, until recently NATO countries reacted with little, if any, activity to those initiatives of the socialist countries, but now that the Soviet Union put forward its proposals on medium-range missiles they displayed a sudden "interest" in those problems, evidently hoping to get a "bargaining chip" for the talks.

On the other hand, the United States and some other NATO countries insist that the Soviet Union give up the link of the problem of reduction of strategic offensive arms by 50 per cent to the problem of preventing strike weapons from being deployed in outer space.

The Soviet Union has emphasized more than once that the linkage between strategic arms reduction and non-militarization of space is a strategic one. It is senseless to reduce strategic arms on earth and at the same time to give the green light to an uncontrollable race in even more dangerous arms in speace that has no boundaries. The Soviet Union shall never agree to undo that package.

The Soviet Union stands for disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, and for the establishment of a comprehensive security system. This is the only way which can make humankind immortal once again.

U.S. Sincerity Questioned

PM301407 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Shalnev commentary: "So, He is Right...." under rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions"]

[Text] ...Question: "And so, the Soviet representative is right when he says that the United States has proposed making Pershing and cruise missiles into shorter-range missiles?" Answer: "This is one of the possibilities which would ensure equal limitations on short-range systems."

This is a direct quotation from a stenographic report on a recent U.S. State Department briefing. Judging by this report, the briefing was almost entirely devoted to the question of the Washington administration's stance on Euromissiles. The discussion was provoked by statements made by Viktor Karpov, chief of administration in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in an IZVESTIYA interview ("Is Their 'Zero Option' a Bluff?", No. 82), during which serious doubts were expressed regarding the sincerity of Washington's stated desire to remove medium-range missiles -- Soviet and American -- from Europe as soon as possible.

The interview has aroused considerable interest in the American capital. The extent of this interest can be judged by the following fact: When answering questions by reporters, State Department spokesman Charles Redman read from a prepared text. In other words, the flood of questions had been foreseen. From my experience in dealing with members of the State Department and White House press departments, I know that the appearance of this text would not have been possible without detailed consultation with the White House and, considering the subject, the Pentagon and the CIA.

If we are talking about the essence of this response, it seems clear that the doubts about the sincerity of Washington's declarations are justified. As we can see from the quote above, the State Department has confirmed that, yes, the administration does in fact propose to turn medium-range missiles into shorter-range missiles. What does this mean? It means, for example, that Pershing-2 missiles will remain in Western Europe -- only in a somewhat truncated form, without the second stage. So what is the "zero option"?

When answering questions, Redman spoke as if this kind of "modification" is only "one of the possibilities." This answer revealed his insincerity: Judging by a report by Jeffrey Smith, a reporter with the capital's WASHINGTON POST who has good sources of information, this is virtually a certainty and not simply a possibility. He writes that the "Martin Marietta Company, which produces these missiles, distributed a brochure several years ago containing a description of the 'one stage concept.' [paragraph continues]

The concept was called 'accessible and approved.'" He continues: "A specialist in the armed forces told me that the problem of increasing a missile's range with the aid of adding a second stage is only 'slightly more complicated' than reducing its range by dismantling the second stage."

You must agree that against this background the statement made at the briefing by the State Department spokesman -- "the zero option is not a bluff" -- is bound to raise doubts. Equally strange, you will agree, is the claim that Karpov's statements in the IZVESTIYA interview reflect "the same Soviet position which has made real negotiations and the achievement of real results so complicated." This is Defense Secretary Weinberger's response.

After quoting this, one cannot fail to ask: What is the real impediment to the elimination of Euromissiles -- Washington's desire to keep them, only in a somewhat modified form, or the fact that Moscow is openly pointing this out?....

3 APRIL UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR TEST AT SEMIPALATINSK

ID030200 Moscow TASS in English 0158 GMT 3 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 3 TASS -- The Soviet Union conducted an underground nuclear explosion within the range of 20 to 150 kilotons at the test site in the Semipalatinsk region today, April 3, 1987, at 5:20 Moscow time.

The test was carried out with a view to perfecting military technology.

TASS REPORTS U.S. TEST OF TOMAHAWK MISSILE

LD021040 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] San Francisco April 2 TASS -- The United States has conducted another Tomahawk cruise missile test.

The ASSOCIATED PRESS reported today, quoting a spokesman for the U.S. Navy, that the missile had been launched from a U.S. warship in the Pacific.

The cruise test was carried out by the Pentagon with a view to perfecting long-range weapon systems that might be used for strategic and tactical purposes and was an integral part of the U.S. military buildup programme.

SOVIET COMMITTEE OF PHYSICIANS AGAINST WAR MEETS

PM011446 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Physicians for the Prevention of War"]

[Text] A session of the Soviet Committee of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War took place 30 March. The committee examined questions of preparations for the Seventh International Conference of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Movement, which is to be held in Moscow in May-June.

In connection with Academician Ye.I. Chazov's appointment as USSR minister of health, M.I. Kuzin, academician of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences and director of the A.V. Vishnevskiy Institute of Surgery, was elected chairman of the committee.

FOREIGN MINISTRY HOLDS NEWS CONFERENCE 31 MAR

Arms Control Issues

LD311956 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1425 GMT 31 Mar 87

[News conference at USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow on 31 March attended by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate; Viktor Karpov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Directorate for Problems of Arms Limitation and Disarmament; and Nikolay Chervov, head of a USSR Armed Forces General Staff Directorate -- recorded]

[Text] [Gerasimov] The Anglo-Soviet summit dialogue has as its main purpose the search for a way to a better world and a reduction of the military threat. This search is being conducted in a friendly tone. The positions and views at times have revealed not only differences, but at times even opposition. However, I will not now mention specific details of these clashes of our views and approaches; they were reflected in the dinner speeches yesterday evening. You have all made a comparative analysis and the speeches have been published. I want to draw attention to the heading under which these speeches are published. The title is this, across the whole page: "In a Friendly Atmosphere."

The interlocutors clearly find each other interesting, but apart from that we favor cooperation with Great Britain; we favor expanded cooperation, and we want that cooperation to acquire a friendly character, and we are in favor of increased trust.

[Unidentified speaker] Recently, the White House published a statement signed by the U.S. President on the results of the stage of work concluded in Geneva by the group for medium-range [srednyaya dalnost] nuclear arms at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms. This document is an attempt to distort the position of the Land of the Soviets on the talks, and asserts in particular that it has moved away from the approach the Soviet Union presented in Reykjavik on missiles with a range of less than 1,000 km. Such assertions do not correspond with reality. The Soviet Union has consistently favored the limitation, reduction and, in the final analysis, the elimination of such missiles. Let me remind you that in Reykjavik, the Soviet side expressed a readiness to freeze missiles with a range of less than 1,000 km and to conduct talks on their future. This line is followed by the Soviet delegation in Geneva. It proposed a freeze on missiles of that range in Europe at the existing levels on both sides and talks on this category of arms.

The Soviet Union's readiness to try to reach a solution to the problems of operational and tactical missiles, taking into account their reduction and elimination, received further development in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 28 February this year. Thus the Soviet Union -- and this is the main thing -- favors resolving the issue precisely in the direction of the reduction and elimination of this category of nuclear arms.

What does the U.S. side advocate? At Geneva it is submitting a claim, which is reflected in the White House statement, to be able to build up U.S. short-range missiles globally and in Europe in particular.

This, in fact, is the essence of the difference in the positions of the sides. The Soviet side has never given its agreement to a buildup in such missiles, since the discussion must be not about legalizing the arms race, but about ending it.

The U.S. approach to missiles of less than medium range [rakety s menshey chem sredney dalnosti] assumes a special meaning in light -- also vigorously defended by the United States -- of the claim that the U.S. Pershing-2's in Europe, which are subject to elimination, could be not eliminated, but converted to missiles with a shorter range. It is clear that in this case the possibility of reconversion would be preserved, that is to say, the actual maintenance of the U.S. potential of medium-range missiles in Europe.

Is this not the source of the U.S. side's persistent attempts to link medium-range missiles with operational and tactical missiles? The fact that a considerable part of the White House statement is devoted precisely to missiles of below medium-range and not at all to how the drafting of a treaty on eliminating the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe can be facilitated attracts attention. This leads one to wonder whether there is an attempt here to complicate the reaching of an agreement on eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe when a real prospect for this opened up as a result of the new Soviet initiative and when practical progress opened up in this area. The Soviet side is also in favor of discussing and resolving the question of operational and tactical missiles, but it opposes the drafting and concluding of a treaty on medium-range missiles being artificially linked with a solution to the question of operational and tactical missiles, let alone made conditional on such a solution. Thank you for your attention.

[Unidentified speaker] Thank you.

[Unidentified speaker] Esteemed comrades, gentlemen, the fourth edition of the book "Whence the Threat to Peace" has been published in the Soviet Union. The book is published in nine languages. Its republication in a considerably expanded edition has been brought about by a number of important events that have taken place in the past 2 and 1/2 years: on the one hand, the vigorous struggle by the Soviet Union for peace, the scrapping of nuclear and other kinds of mass destruction weapons, for a considerable reduction in conventional armaments and for the establishment of an all-embracing system of international security; on the other hand, the U.S. Administration's course toward an unrestrained arms race, the achieving of military superiority, and material preparation for war.

The threat to peace -- not a mythical one but a real one -- emanates from the U.S. military machine, from Washington's belligerent policy, from its attempt to run international affairs from a position of strength, including the use of armed forces. This is backed up in the book by specific facts, and first and foremost by the fact that it is the United States that has always been, and today remains, the instigator of the arms race. The Pentagon is currently pushing ahead with a multibillion-dollar program of chemical rearmament. It is developing biological weapons and striving to put weapons into space as quickly as possible and to threaten the whole of mankind from space.

[Tokyo NHK Television Network correspondent] NHK, Japan. Yesterday Mrs Thatcher said that there is currently a superiority in short-range missiles, a nine-to-one ratio. What have you to say about that, and what is your attitude to the issue?

[Unidentified speaker] I will answer your question, and another one raised here, that Weinberger has stated that the USSR is ahead of the United States in ICBM's and SLBM's by a factor of four to one, and the ratio for short-range missiles is nine to one. What must I tell you? First, to assess military potential, they must be taken all together, and we must not extract individual components.

I will quote you these figures; I have already spoken in my statement about naval forces. The United States has a superiority of 2.5 to 1 over the Soviet Union in nuclear warheads on submarine-based ballistic missiles; it has twice as many major surface vessels; it has an absolute superiority in aircraft carriers -- the United States has 20, and we have none at all. Their superiority in naval aircraft is 2.5 to 1; in the Marines it is 16 to 1; and in total naval tonnage the United States has a twofold advantage over the Soviet Navy. Why doesn't the United States pose the question of eliminating the imbalance in naval forces? Why does it aim to eliminate ground forces, to reduce the ground forces of the Soviet Union? Apart from this, it must be taken into account that the NATO countries have a considerable advantage, of almost 1.5 to 1, in tactical strike aircraft in Europe.

We do not deny that, yes, we do have more tactical missiles -- I stress, tactical missiles. The NATO countries have more tactical nuclear weapons. The advantage is on the NATO side in tactical strike aircraft. Thus it is probable that the fundamental issue is not whether one or the other side has 10 or 100 missiles more; the fundamental issue is to sit down to try to reach agreement and level out the questions of imbalance.

[Prague CTK correspondent] CTK. I would like to return to the ABM Treaty about which Comrade Chervov also spoke. What is your view on the conclusion of Senator Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, concerning the interpretation of the ABM Treaty?

[Unidentified speaker] We have always maintained the view that the understanding of the treaty by the sides was quite clearly expressed in the treaty itself at the time that the ABM Treaty was signed and ratified. In fact, this is what Senator Nunn, too, now has confirmed in his analysis of the treaty and of the discussions which accompanied the ratification of the treaty in the U.S. Senate. He came to what we view as the only correct conclusion, that during the ratification of the ABM Treaty in the U.S. Senate, all the statements concerned only one interpretation and that was the one inherent in the text of the treaty. There was at that time no mention of any broad interpretation. In our view, Senator Nunn has come to the correct conclusion, that the U.S. Administration does not have any right to resort to any other interpretation than the one that was laid down at the time of ratification of the treaty without the agreement of the Senate itself.

[Unidentified speaker, in English with superimposed translation] General Chervov, I shall return again to short-range missiles. If what the Americans are proposing in fact consists of a buildup which will in the final analysis lead to parity in short-range missiles in Europe, what is it that you do not like about that?

[Chervov] There are two points that we do not like. The first is that we are in general against building up nuclear weapons in Europe -- whether they are U.S. or Soviet makes no difference. So we propose the elimination, the reduction and elimination of operational and tactical missiles, and we are prepared to sit at the negotiating table.

Marine Case 'Spy Mania'

LD311429 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS -- The case of U.S. Marines in the American Embassy in Moscow is another unnecessary outburst of a spy mania, said Gennadiy Gerasimov, spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.

He answered questions asked in connection with reports appearing in the Western press to the effect that U.S. authorities were planning to recall all Marines from its embassy in Moscow because some of them had allegedly been implicated in espionage for the U.S.S.R.

Speaking at a news briefing here today for Soviet and foreign media people, the spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said that the case added oil to the smoldering flames of a spy mania in the U.S. with respect to the Soviet Union. It can only evoke a smile in Moscow, Gerasimov said.

'Regret' Over Arrests in France

LD311448 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS -- The continuing anti-Soviet campaign in France in connection with arrests by French secret services of a group of experts specializing in missile and space technology is viewed with regret in Moscow, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists in Moscow today.

Accusations to the effect that a Soviet representative in France was engaged in banned activity are absurd and we strongly deny them, Gerasimov emphasized.

In our opinion, the spokesman said, it is an attempt to damage Soviet-French relations, to kindle feelings of mistrust and outright animosity toward the Soviet people.

This time the target chosen for attacks is Soviet-French cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space where, and this is commonly recognized, the Soviet Union is successfully using the latest technology.

We have repeatedly expressed readiness to share on a mutual basis our achievements with other countries, France among them. For over 20 years we have worked with France in the study and uses of outer space for peaceful purposes. A total of 40 joint projects have been implemented and some 400 French scientists have taken part in carrying them out.

In 1982 French and Soviet cosmonauts made a space flight aboard a Soviet craft. It was agreed that the next such flight would be held in 1988. The French side, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said, has repeatedly noted that cooperation in space was model in character and that both sides stood to gain from it.

Greek, Turkish Restraint Urged

LD311304 Moscow TASS in English 1241 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS -- The current Greek-Turkish differences are being heightened by external circles interested in whipping up tensions in the Mediterranean, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou clearly stated on March 27 that it was the United States which was responsible for the situation in the Aegean Sea.

Any aggravation of relations between nations that might involve use of force, the more so in such a sensitive region as the eastern Mediterranean, was causing tangible damage to interests of maintaining stability in the Mediterranean and the Balkans and complicating the development of positive processes of cooperation in Europe.

The USSR appealed to the Governments of Greece and Turkey to display necessary restraint and avoid any actions that might complicate the situation in the Aegean Sea.

The Soviet side proceeded from the premise that any outstanding issues should be settled by peaceful political means without use or threat of force.

CPSU'S SHISHLIN ON FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

AU260913 Budapest MAGYARORSZAG in Hungarian No 12 March 87 p 4

[Interview given by Nikolay Shishlin, deputy department head of the CPSU Central Committee, to correspondent Peter Vajda "in Hungary last week": "New Approach -- 'Spring' Political Exhibitions -- At Least One Step Away From the Abyss"]

[Text] [Vajda] In our discussion today we primarily would like to speak -- no matter how sketchily -- about the current world political efforts and world political concepts of the Soviet Union. You in the Soviet Union recently successfully concluded a forum which -- in terms of the wide circle of participants and the openness of the debate -- the international peace movement has been unable to organize for years. How do you explain this?

[Shishlin] There are many reasons behind this. One is the increasing recognition of the fact that, for the first time in history, mankind has no guarantee of surviving a nuclear war. This fact is recognized by people such as physicians, among whom the peace movement is spreading like wildfire, and physicists, the best part of whom had already been aware of the danger at the beginning of the nuclear power advances in the forties. A second reason is that it has been clearer than ever before that the accumulating global problems can no longer be solved within national boundaries. A third reason is local conflicts. The main issue, however, is that the calendar showed the year 1987 and the place was Moscow where this policy was being asserted, not only in word but also in deed, a policy we were witnessing. Naturally, the worldwide interest in Gorbachev's personality and in Soviet policy also played a great role.

Peace Continues To Be the Goal [subhead]

[Vajda] Did the wide range of those present at the forum, including the presence of well-known and controversial personalities such as Academician Sakharov, play a role in the success of the forum?

[Shishlin] Concerning Sakharov, the answer is both yes and no. Many people regarded Academician Sakharov's presence as an expression not only of the new Soviet approach toward guaranteeing human rights, but of the wide range of views that were allowed to be represented at the forum. Academician Sakharov took part in the forum's activity, expressed his views on the moratorium and SDI, the disarmament issue, and human rights. He expressed views that differ from the official Soviet stand and views corresponding with it. All this showed the wide range of debate that was allowed to develop. On the other hand, why did I say no? I said this because although Sakharov's presence expressed an important nuance in the forum's work, this still was not the determining factor behind the great success of the forum.

[Vajda] What do you consider to be most important in the development of international relations in the recent past in the development of international relations and what are the prospects of rebuilding detente? Can we talk of a new Soviet foreign policy?

[Shishlin] Many things occurred last year in this respect. I refer, first of all, to our own initiatives -- and I include here the contact-building activity and the efforts for dialogue with the capitalist countries that were made by Hungary and the other fraternal countries. The goal was to improve the trend of international development. Reykjavik, of course, played the determining role and, on the one hand, it showed how dramatic the situation was and, on the other hand, that there were possibilities for change.

With regard to the new foreign policy, the goal continues to be to secure peace, and from this point of view the goal is not brand new. It is, nevertheless, new in its approach, because it attributes the greatest importance ever to the goals, hopes, dangers, and risks that affect the whole of mankind -- and all this in a world in which mutual relations and interdependence are asserted.

[Vajda] Back to Reykjavik: We know that a package deal was discussed there. Why has the issue of intermediate-range missiles been dropped from the package deal since then? What are the chances?

[Shishlin] With regard to the first part of the question, we wanted to take three or four steps away from the abyss at one stroke. However, when it became clear that this would not work, one could not say that it is not worth taking even one step. Then, let it be one step, we decided. This, of course, does not mean that the other issues -- strategic arms limitation, adherence to SALT, avoiding a war in space and halting nuclear tests -- are no longer on the agenda. As for the chances: We are facing months of complex diplomatic activity, of concentrated efforts, months of joint activity if we want to reach an agreement this year, since it is certain that this year the Warsaw Pact countries already will have coordinated their high-level evaluation of the situation. Our common goal is to achieve a breakthrough this year, at least in one area. In addition, one should be aware of the fact that in this respect much also depends on the attitude of the West European countries. These countries have their own interests, let us regard them as national or selfish interests, but we must take them into account as realities.... As for the United States itself, we, after all, have extended our Geneva dialoue, and Secretary of State George Shultz will travel to Moscow in April. We do not plan a 1-day meeting but a deep exchange of views. We are also in contact with the White House on this issue.

The Situation of Relations [subhead]

[Vajda] Is the White House interested in signing an agreement with the Soviet Union in the given period?

[Shishlin] There are groups in the administration that are interested in such an agreement. I was pleasantly surprised when Mr Perle from the Department of Defense declared that such an agreement was possible, while Defense Secretary Weinberger himself was making 1,001 objections to it. There is, therefore, a moderate wing in the administration; all these, of course, are relative concepts in such an administration, as we are talking here about a right-wing administration as a whole. However, the main thing is whether there will be a majority political will, whether they are ready to take into account objective political realities, such as the new congress which, in my view, cannot be ignored. Neither can they shine white with innocence after the Irangate affair. In addition, the U.S. President must take into consideration the time factor if he tries to bring about results. [paragraph continues]

I do not exclude the possibility that after a complex political struggle the U.S. Administration will be ready to settle the issue after all.

[Vajda] Can this mean a summit this year?

[Shishlin] If we could work out a mutually acceptable European zero-option for the Soviet Union and the United States, based on compromise, this no doubt would be worth signing in Washington by the general secretary and the President.

[Vajda] What are the prospects with regard to Soviet-Chinese relations?

[Shishlin] We recently held border negotiations with the PRC. These were renewed negotiations after a considerably long time. They are all the more worthy of attention because they took place after certain internal processes had taken place in China. On the basis of the Chinese comrades' attitude at the talks and their entire nature, we had the impression that the trend toward improving Soviet-Chinese relations was continuing. Of course, we cannot expect a "stormy shift to spring" in Soviet-Chinese relations. The political practice of long years of alienation and even hostility has thrown us too far apart for this. But the process of rapprochement is becoming steady. After the state of deep freeze, this is a healthier temperature. Our economic, cultural, technical, scientific, and sports relations are developing at a rather good pace.

The Problem of Afghanistan [subhead]

[Vajda] What are the prospects for a peaceful political solution to the situation in Afghanistan?

[Shishlin] I am sure that in the coming years we already will be able to say that there is no Afghan issue any more, and that it has been dropped from the agenda of world political issues. The prospects of an independent, neutral, and nonaligned Afghanistan which has normal relations with the Soviet Unicn and from which the Soviet military contingency has been withdrawn are already emerging. Of course, this will not take place in 1 or 2 months. On the other hand, with regard to all regional conflicts, when we say that these conflicts have no military-technical solution, then here we do not mean only South Africa and the Middle East, but also Afghanistan. That is why the Soviet Union supports Afghanistan's efforts to create a national reconciliation. Of course, this is not a simple process, because too much pain and hostile feeling has accumulated, but the inhabitants of the country have the same homeland and the same fate; this fate depends on national reconciliation.

[Vajda] To what extent do events depend on the foreign support given to the counterrevolutionary forces?

[Shishlin] It is, indeed, sometimes difficult to tell who is doing more to prolong the bloodshed, the Afghan counterrevolutionary leaders or official Washington. But in the final analysis, foreign intervention can not be the determining factor in the fate of our southern neighbor. If we take into consideration the position of the Afghan Government, the masses' weariness of bloodshed, the help provided by the Soviet Union in creating peace, and the development of the position of foreign Muslim circles, then there are realistic prospects for peace.

GERASIMOV HOLDS NEWS CONFERENCE 2 APRIL

Denies Israeli Envoy Statement

LD021420 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow, 2 Apr (TASS) -- There is surprise in the Soviet Union at the statement by Israel's ambassador to Washington, Me'ir Rosenne, distributed on Wednesday by REUTER, declared Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs at a news conference today.

The statement claimed that "under an agreement which has been reached, a Soviet delegation will visit Israel, and an Israeli delegation will visit the Soviet Union." This statement is lacking foundation, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman indicated. There can only be question of a trip to Israel by a group of Soviet consular officials having a narrow technical task: to solve consular questions, connected with the residence of Soviet citizens in Israel, to put their juridical position in order, to study the state of Soviet real estate in Israel, and to put its status in order.

Last year, Gerasimov recalled, a meeting was held in Helsinki between representatives of the consular directorate of the Soviet Foreign Ministry and Israeli Foreign Ministry. At that time, the Israeli side demanded what it called reciprocity and set other conditions. All this was rejected by the Soviet side. It was said that Israel, unlike the Soviet Union, had no real estate in the USSR, nor have we permanent residents with Israeli passports, so there is no basis for reciprocity.

In the course of subsequent contacts, in which, incidentally, Mr Rosenne took part, the Soviet position remained unchanged. The Soviet Union is not considering linking the journey by this group with the reception of a similar group from Israel in the USSR, for reasons set forth during the Helsinki meeting.

It is clear from agency reports that some people cannot refrain from using these secondary issues to cast a shadow over the Soviet policy on the near East, and sow doubt among the friends of the Soviet Union as to its consistency. The USSR's position with regard to the Near East is well known, and with regard to Israel too. It remains unchanged, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed.

Reduced Greek-Turkish Tension

LD021329 Moscow TASS in English 1319 GMT 2 Apr 87

["At the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS -- The Soviet Union has received with gratification the reports on a relaxation of tensions in the Aegean Sea area, Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a press conference at the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry today. In that context, he said, the proposal of Greece on referring the question of delimitation of the continental shelf to the international court in accordance with the principles of international law, seems to be positive.

The spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry voiced hope that the expression of goodwill by both sides would ultimately lead to a peaceful settlement of disputable issues.

Mongolian Troop Withdrawal

OW030019 Tokyo KYODO in English 0003 GMT 3 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow, April 2 KYODO -- The Soviet Union will start a partial troop withdrawal from Mongolia on April 16, Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasomiv said Thursday [2 April].

He made the announcement at a press conference but did not give the exact number of military personnel scheduled to be pulled out of Mongolia.

The Soviet Government announced in January that a mechanized sharpshooting division and a number of troops will be brought home from April to June.

It will be the first Soviet troops withdrawal from Mongolia since relations between Moscow and Beijing became strained in the 1960s over ideological differences.

Although the Soviet Union has never disclosed the number, it is said that an estimated five divisions -- about 75,000 military personnel -- are currently stationed in Mongolia.

Pakistani Afghan Plane Downing

LD021332 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow, 2 Apr (TASS) -- The Soviet Union denounces the criminal act of the Pakistan Air Force and condemns it as a serious provocation directed at thwarting a settlement of the situation surrounding Afghanistan and at further whipping up tension in this Asian region, a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman declared at a news conference today.

On 30 March three U.S.-made aircraft of the Pakistan Air Force intruded into Afghan airspace and downed with missiles an Afghan AN-26 civilian aircraft on a flight on the Kabul-Khowst route. As a result of this criminal act, 40 persons including 2 children were killed.

Thatcher's Nuclear Arms Stance

LD021451 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS -- "The visit to the Soviet Union by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain is being positively assessed in the Soviet Union," Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated at a press conference at the ministry's press centre today.

"The visit is of great importance for the development of bilateral relations. The dialogue with Britain has been raised to a new level. The visit gave an opportunity to have a frank exchange of views on various issues, to compare the positions of the sides, and to specify their intentions. A number of agreements were signed."

"At the same time from the Soviet Union's point of view, the visit has also laid bare the circumstances that the old way of thinking dominates among the British leadership."

"According to the old way of thinking, weapons are a boon and nuclear weapons are the greatest boon because weapons are terrible and nuclear weapons are superterrible and so much the better."

"This view is opposite to the Soviet Union's viewpoint according to which nuclear weapons are an evil."

"But the point of view of Mrs. Thatcher runs counter not only to our's but also to the viewpoint of the President of the United States who said he dreamed of living to see a nuclear-free world and who also considers nuclear weapons an evil which it might be as well to get rid of."

"When speaking to the Kremlin Mrs. Thatcher said that a world without nuclear weapons would become less stable and more dangerous. At the same time she supported President Reagan's SDI. As Reagan put it, SDI is needed as the key to a nuclear-free world. Thus, the purpose of the SDI, according to Reagan, in words, at least, is a world without nuclear weapons.

"According to Thatcher, such a world is a bad one and a dangerous one. A good world, in her view, is a world with nuclear weapons."

"The old way of thinking", the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said, "also manifested itself in accusations levelled at the Soviet Union that its plans ostensibly include efforts to promote the cultivation of communism throughout the world and that it is these efforts that make the West arm itself."

"Those are old cliches which have been and are being used to justify the arms race. Such an interepretation of the world situation does not promote a peaceful development and is fraught with great dangers to our world which is oversaturated with nuclear weapons."

"Nucleophilia, the love of everything nuclear, expressed by the distinguished British guest also questions the reasonableness of the policy of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Such a stand runs counter to the Treaty on Non-proliferation of Nuclear weapons and leads to the spread of nuclear weapons and to a growing risk of an outbreak of nuclear war."

"The maintenance of the old political thinking in London hinders the East-West dialogue and complicates a constructive discussion of international security issues," the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said.

"Nevertheless, on a number of points the sides found common elements. These are the issue of medium-range missiles, although certain reservations were expressed by the British side, the issue of eliminating chemical weapons, and the attitude of the Helsinki process -- a positive desire to promote its development. Common elements were also discovered in the approaches to some regional conflicts and to their resolution by political means."

"Britain coud play a greater role than the one she plays now, considering her resources for solving the cardinal issues of war and peace," the spokesman for the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs said.

TASS ON U.S., NATO ARMS SUPPLIES TO RSA

LD022153 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS -- Follows commentary by Sergey Kulik, a TASS news analyst:

A report has been prepared for the U.S. Congress on the clandestine supplies by the NATO member countries of weapons to the racist RSA in violation of the embargo clamped down by the United Nations Organisation. Involved in the arms supplies were the FRG, France, Britain, Italy and a number of other West European nations. Reporting on that, the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST points out that the links of the European countries with the RSA will be described in the report with so much detail that this may touch off tensions in relations inside NATO. Therefore it is planned to classify a larger part of that document and publish only its short, corrected version.

This is, certainly, an extremely ticklish question for Western Europe. Suffice it to recall that the details of the sale of blueprints to the RSA for the construction of submarines of the latest design disclosed on the eve of the recent parliamentary elections in the FRG have caused on the banks of the Rhine something like "RSAgate". By analogy with Washington's Irangate, involved in the deal with the racists were representatives of the top echelons of power.

Now other West European nations mentioned in the administration's report to the Congress, may find themselves on the threshold of similar "RSAgates."

One cannot help asking, for example, who sanctioned access for the racists to the French Exocet missile MM-38, whose technical characteristics were used in the creation of a new type of guided missile Scorpio? How did it happen that Pretoria could bribe some French technical experts, who participated in the Exocet (?programme), as the journal AFRIQUE-ASIE said? How the French helicopters Puma and Alouette made by the French Aerospatial Company find their way into the South African concern Armcor producing weapons with a number of British firms?

Washington itself is clearly involved in such affairs. By trying to divert attention from its own Irangate by the West European "RSAgate," the authors of the report pass over in silence that in 1983 alone the USA shipped to the racists more than 100 kg of enriched uranium which is enough for the production of ten A-Bombs. Some 40 American nuclear physicists are employed at the South African nuclear facilities, THE WASHINGTON POST said. The latest electronic equipment for Pretoria's nuclear programmes is supplied to the RSA from the United States. The overseas clients of the racists have also taken care to supply their friends with delivery vehicles.

The strengthening of the RSA's military potential is a source of serious concern for the independent African nations. The imperialist powers, said Didymus Mutasa, speaker of the House of Assembly of Zimbabwe's Parliament, not only foil the efforts of the international community directed at imposing effective sanctions on the Pretoria regime, but also supply the racists with the technology and equipment they need for the manufacturer of mass destruction weapons. This may also have grave consequences for the whole humanity, bearing in mind the apartheid state's aggressive and expansionist policy.

RYZHKOV SENDS GREETINGS TO UN ECE SESSION

PM020901 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 87 First Edition p 1

[Text] To the 42d session of the UN Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

On behalf of the Soviet Government, I greet the Economic Commission for Europe on its 40th anniversary.

The ECE occupies an important place in the system of international economic organizations designed to promote equitable and mutually favorable international economic relations, the solution of practical problems of cooperation in this field between countries with different social structures, and above all between East and West. The Soviet Union values the contribution of the ECE to the development of pan-European economic cooperation and would like possibilities of the commission to be used in full measure in the future, too, for the common good of all states participating in its activity.

Regarding pan-European economic cooperation as an important factor in guaranteeing the stable development of the economies of the states in the region and the improvement of the political climate, the Soviet Government calls upon the ECE member countries to do their utmost to help galvanize that organization's work in such topical areas as trade, industrial cooperation, science and technology, environmental protection, power engineering, transport, and others.

For its part, in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union intends to continue consistently rendering assistance in further developing multilateral economic cooperation both in the European region and beyond its borders, and in expanding the useful activities performed by the commission and its bodies to resolve pan-European economic problems.

The measures being undertaken in our country to restructure and radically improve the management and organization of the Soviet Union's external economic links and the policy of expanding the sphere of international industrial and scientific-technical cooperation, including the participation of partners from Western countries, reflect the Soviet Union's peace-loving direction in foreign policy and our unwavering striving to bring the international situation back to normal.

A beneficial stimulus could be given to the development of comprehensive cooperation with the ECE by a successful conclusion to the Vienna meting of the representatives of the states participating in the CSCE, at which the USSR jointly with other socialist countries is applying all its efforts to enrich pan-European cooperation with new and significant initiatives in the field of economics, science and technology, and the preservation of the environment.

A fuller use of the potential of the ECE, including realization of the clauses of the CSCE final act, will serve to create stable and predictable economic relations in the European region and serve the cause of peace.

BORIN: U.S. 'NEOGLOBALISM' LINKED TO SDI PLANS

PM021545 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Apr 87 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Borin "International Notes": "In the Neoglobalist Deadlock"]

[Text] U.S. right-wing conservative circles and the U.S. military-industrial complex are intensely seeking a "way out" of the political deadlock in which the United States has been driven by the Washington administration's adventurist actions. After all, over the 18 months when the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions was in affect, the world saw for itself who was really striving to achieve military superiority. Reykjavik also opened many people's eyes to the real state of affairs. There is a serious crisis of confidence in Washington even among the U.S. allies. According to reports in THE GUARDIAN, opinion polls in Britain, France, the FRG, and Italy showed that only 30 percent of those polled believed in the administration's "honest intentions" to end the arms race.

You would think these facts ought to encourge the U.S. leading circles to pursue a more realistic policy. No such thing has yet happened. What is happening is the direct opposite. All sorts of recent "seminars" and "conferences," in which conservative organizations were largely active, have shown that people in the United States are striving to find a way out of the deadlock through an accelerated implementation of Washington's aggressive aims.

Moreover, the sinister "Star Wars" program is now already linked directly with the equally sinister concept of neoglobalism. Let us recall that the United States is attempting to implement within the framework of the strategy of neoglobalism some sort of exclusive "right" of Washington to interfere in the internal affairs of other states, is aiming to undermine and eliminate their legitimate governments which are not to the liking of U.S. imperialism, and is giving military assistance to various gangs of renegades fighting against their own people.

Now, however, in the opinion of U.S. "hawks," when the U.S. military department intends to submit to Congress options for the deployment of the "primary" SDI system in the very near future, the time has come to "modernize" and concretize the plans for neoglobalist piracy. It follows from the speeches made at the conference of conservative political action committees held in Washington that U.S. right-wing circles seriously expect the implementation of SDI will be a step toward the achievement of worldwide hegemony.

The scenario drawn up by the "hawks" is not all that complex. They calculate that, as a result of the deployment of SDI, U.S. territory will be proof against a counterstrike. On the other hand, strike space complexes coupled with nuclear missile weapons ought to pose a constant threat against the Soviet Union.

In this situation, the right-wingers dream, the time will have come to tackle "earthly problems" -- the overthrow of disliked governments in Asian, African, and Latin American countries.

The "hawks" in the United States are not only talking. They are also acting. For example, the establishment of yet another subversive "foundation" was loudly announced recently. Under the leadership of former U.S. Ambassador to Romania Funderburk, it will assist "the struggle against the spread of communism in the world in the course of low-intensity conflicts."

In other words, in the future this "nongovernmental organization" will be assigned very specific tasks in planning the launching of regional wars. The immediate task is also clearly formulated: "It is important to secure the downfall of at least one Marxist government." This is just for starters!

Later they intend to ensure that "more sophisticated" propaganda, political, psychological, and economic actions are taken against the socialist community countries. At the third stage, it was noted at the gathering of the conservative political action committees, the main efforts must be channeled toward... promoting "the USSR's disintegration into national formations." That is how they intend to "consign communism to the scrapheap of history." No less!

The history of the invention of such "scenarios" goes back several decades. "In June 1946, soon after the Potsdam Conference," according to the book "Winning a Nuclear War. The Pentagon's Secret War Plans," which was recently published in the United States, "the Joint Chiefs of Staff finished formulating the first detailed plan for an atomic war -- a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union code-named 'Pincher.' It defined in detail the precise number of aircraft carrying atom bombs, army divisions, and ships which would be 'needed to crush the Soviet Union.'"

The paramount task of this plan, as is shown by declassified government documents, was "to crush the Soviet Union or at least force it to capitulate on terms acceptable to the United States." This barbaric plan for the destruction of the Soviet state was logically continued in the scenarios for attacks on the USSR elaborated by the Pentagon and code-named "Bushwhacker," "Broiler," "Gunpowder," "Doublestar," "Fleetwood," and many, many others.

They console themselves with similar ravings today, but now involving SDI. The "future plans" being elaborated by U.S. right-wing conservative circles are in no way aimed at a constructive approach toward solving the most important problems of international security. The course of confrontation will not help official Washington get out of the political deadlock.

COMMENTARY ON TOWER REPORT, 'SOVIET THREAT'

NC021306 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 1 Apr 87

[Text] The U.S. mass media have reported that the Pentagon has drawn up a plan to strike at Iran and that the U.S. Navy stationed in the Persian Gulf may be used for this purpose. We invite you to listen to comments by Soviet political analyst (Georgiy Struiy)

This report was received at a time when I was perusing the findings of the Tower Commission report. As you know, this commission, which was made up of prominent politicians, had been charged with investigating the tangled history of the Iran-contras affair. It was stressed that its members would reveal the truth of the matter.

It would not be true to say that the commission completely failed in its duties. It succeeded in revealing a series of documents proving the extent of the impudence of influential circles in the Reagan administration, and Reagan himself did not emerge much better than the others. At the same time, many of the questions asked by the U.S. public remained unanswered, and it is difficult to discover the answers. For example, it was not made at all clear whether or not Reagan was aware of the U.S. law banning the sale of arms to the Nicaraguan rebels.

It is chiefly the Americans themselves who have been upset by this issue; such details are not important to the Nicaraguan people who are being killed by U.S. mortars.

As for Iran, the Tower Commission actually supported the motives propounded by the Reagan administration. The commission stated that the objective of the operation was not the furtherance of U.S. ambitions but the advancement, up to a point, of Iran's interests, and the protection of international security. It was revealed that the White House is concerned over Moscow's so-called undesirable objectives vis-a-vis Iran. Washington alleges that the Soviet Union is interfering in Iran's domestic affairs and is even entertaining the thought of occupying it. It is interesting to note that the commotion about the so-called Soviet threat to Iran started a long time ago. It was in the mid-seventies that the CIA began to produce studies on Soviet efforts to occupy Persian Gulf countries to solve its oil problem. During the Reagan administration, reports on secret Pentagon documents were published in the press, speaking of expansionist attempts against Iran from the North that could lead to a third world war. Moreover, the Reagan administration did not limit itself to preparing this military scenario; it placed completely fabricated reports -- which it had allegedly gathered by its satellites -- at Iran's disposal on preparations by Soviet troops to invade Iran.

The intentions behind all this were to disrupt Soviet-Iranian relations and to hide the United States' own expansionist objectives by spreading mistrust in these two countries' relations. Finally, it should be said that the Central Command that has been formed by Reagan is not a tourist agency sending RDF soldiers on leisure trips to Shiraz or Esfahan. Thus, the reports on preparations by the Pentagon to strike at Iran with its aircraft carrier and the Tower Commission report lead us to the conclusion that Washington is pursuing an aggressive policy, a policy of exacerbating tensions and fomenting trouble between neighbors in the Persian Gulf.

TASS, CITES NSC 'DIRECTIVE' ON CONCENTRATION CAMPS

LD021903 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS -- TASS news analyst Valentin Vasilets writes:

Three years ago, or, to be more exact, on April 5, 1984, President Ronald Reagan of the United States signed a National Security Council [NSC] directive which the White House would have preferred never to mention and which would not be reckoned among its achievements even by biographers who sympathise with the President most of all.

No one in the United States recalls the secret directive even now that the NSC's dirty linen is being washed in public and much from its unlawful and unseemly activities is coming to light.

Meanwhile the above-mentioned directive has no constitutional or legal basis, and its meaning glaringly contradicts the present administration's public statements and assurances.

This is a secret document codenamed REX-84 which contains emergency instructions for the setting up of ten concentration camps in various parts of the country, with the camps being intended for 200,000 prisoners.

The White House allocated ten million dollars for the purpose. Thus, the Reagan administration considered it a task of extreme importance to launch an extensive programme of preparation for mass oppressions.

Who is meant to become a victim of such unprecedented police round-ups? The answer to this question, which constitutes the principal secret of the directive, reveals, first of all, the extent to which the present U.S. Administration views civil freedoms and human rights in its own country as conventional, abstract categories.

At one after numerous interviews taken from government officials and the military, SPOTLIGHT magazine found out that immigrants were to become the first target of the planned police operation. They were meant to be detained and deported.

But the REX-84 directive had another purpose: to apply the so-called C-and-C (capture and custody) measures to U.S. citizens whom the government would deem "dangerous" or "suspicious".

The authorities' critics, suspected of belonging to organizations "prone to violence", and so on, would get into lists of such people.

The magazine pointed out that this meant that people reading "wrong newspapers" would be thrown into those camps. In point of fact the government was preparing for an unprecedented-in-scope onslaught on "its enemies".

All those who follow speeches by U.S. Government officials have long ceased to be surprised at the double standard with which officials approach to human rights in their own country and abroad.

Nonetheless, the REX-84 case is striking by the cynical gap between declarations and a true attitude to human rights.

Is it possible, while talking about the inviolability of human rights, to prepare a frontal onslaught of such a scope on them at the same time? It has turned out that such thing is possible.

It is noteworthy that the U.S. Congress is literally swamped with speeches and resolutions in defence of human rights -- in the Soviet Union.

And the less grounds for that, the greater the anti-Soviet ardour of the congressmen.

However, there is nothing paradoxical in this, since the human rights issue has long become in actual fact a bargaining chip in the political games of the west.

It is not fortuitous that over the past three years the Congress and other false guardians of freedoms have not found either time or willingness to ascertain how the programme for the establishment of concentration camps tallies with the notion of freedoms and simply with respect for the constitution. Such questions still await an answer.

CORRESPONDENT NOTES 'OSTENTATION' IN PYONGYANG

PM031037 Moscow TRUD in Russian 3 Apr 87 P 3

[Special correspondent V. Golovachev "Korean Notebook" article: "Pyongyang's Skyscrapers"]

[Excerpts] Pyongyang-Moscow -- [passage omitted] The planned massive housing complex in Kwangbok, in the capital's southwestern outskirts, which is already under construction, is unquestionably interesting. I don't know of any other street, or rather urban road, anywhere else like the one that will be built here. The width of the actual road will be 100 meters, and the distance between apartment blocks on either side will be 160-180 meters. Unique public buildings and apartment blocks will be built and hexagonal skyscrapers will rise all along the length of this road -- right up to Palgol Bridge, a distance of 5.4 km. It is also planned to build the largest apartment block in the DPRK, consisting of more than 1,150 apartments. People proudly say about it: "If a child born in this block were to spend one night in each of its rooms, it would get back to its own apartment more than 11 years later."

I looked at the model apartment blocks displayed at an exhibition, admired the project, and at the same time thought: What will all this splendor cost? And how much did other projects cost? Of course, architecture has always given priority to esthetics and beauty, but comfort and cost-effectiveness have ranked together with them.... Has all this expenditure always been justified? It is extremely substantial for the DPRK economy, which currently faces complex tasks.

There can be no argument on one point: Construction work in Korea is fast and to high standards. It is planned that the aforementioned unique Kwangbok complex will be built in just 3 years. Is this realistic? I think so. The following example confirms this. The center of Pyongyang is adorned by the grand Palace of Study, built in the traditional national style. Ten stories, ten marble-clad blocks, 100,000 square meters of useful area, numerous interconnected roofs with curved edges like pagodas, which took 750,000 blue roof tiles.... And this entire vast palace was built in 1 year and 9 months.

This ostentation [paradnost] can also be seen in Kim Il-song Square which, together with its adjacent streets, can accommodate 100,000 persons assembling for a rally; around the Triumphal Gates; and in the new districts. I made my way back to the hotel along beautiful Changgang Street. The windows of exquisite restaurants and bars glittered. But all the premises were deserted. Maybe foreigners would come here in the evening....

Pyongyang is the pride of the DPRK's citizens. Admittedly, maybe, not all of them have managed to visit here yet. It is expensive and, furthermore, to travel from one population center in the country to another people have to be on an official assignment or have special authorization. But people even in the most isolated regions know the capital from magazine photographs and admire it.

Pyongyang is the face of the new Korea. Architectural forms will pass on to future generations not only the architects' designs but also the spirit of the time, its signs, the atmosphere of these years....

MPR GENERAL DEPARTS MOSCOW ON TOUR OF COUNTRY

PM021505 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Apr 87 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "On Tour of the Country"]

[Text] Lieutenant General S. Jadambaa, first deputy minister of defense of the Mongolian People's Republic and chief of General Staff of the Mongolian People's Armed Forces, who is on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, left Moscow 30 March. He was seen off at the airport by Colonel General V.N. Lobov, Col Gen G.F. Krivosheyev, Col Gen of Aviation V.Ye. Pankin, and Lt Gen G.A. Borisov.

Minister Plenipotentiary (T. Gombosuren), counselor at the Mongolian Embassy in the USSR, was in the sendoff party.

An honor guard was formed at the airport for the high-ranking guest. Lt Gen S. Jadambaa received the report of the commander of the honor guard and inspected the formation of Soviet servicemen.

During his tour of the country the Mongolian guest will be accompanied by Lt Gen Ye.A. Yevstigneyev.

JAPAN TO EASE TRADE FRICTION WITH U.S. THROUGH SDI

OW030439 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone has decided to send Shintaro Abe, chairman of the Executive Council of the Liberal Democratic Party, to the United States as his special envoy. The purpose of Abe's trip is to adjust trade and economic frictions between the two countries before the prime minister's scheduled visit to Washington.

The Moscow newspaper PRAVDA notes that the Japanese Government feels that it will be able to ease the tension over the economic controversy through Japan's expanded military cooperation and participation in President Reagan's Star Wars program.

IZVESTIYA ON OBSTACLES TO DRA RECONCILIATION

PM021535 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Those Who Are Trying To Wreck National Reconciliation"]

[Text] Kabul, 31 Mar -- Forces opposed to the establishment of peace in Afghanistan have again tried to foil the process of national reconciliation in the DRA. As BAKHTAR has reported, four people were killed and several passers-by were seriously injured when a mine, planted by counterrevolutionaries at the entrance to the main mosque in Qandahar, exploded.

The crimes being committed by antigovernment groups can be traced to neighboring Iran and Pakistan, from whose territory an undeclared war is being waged. It is through Pakistan that the United States supplies Afghan dushmans with Stinger antiaircraft missiles, which have been used to shoot down two civil aircraft this year alone. Over 100 sabotage centers have been set up on Pakistani territory where Western and Pakistani instructors training terrorists and coach them in the "art" of killing.

Some 35,000 former refugees have returned to Afghanistan since the policy of national reconciliation was proclaimed. This figure could have undoubtedly been higher had the Pakistani and Iranian authorities not placed obstacles in the way of all those determined to return home. As DRA Foreign Minister Abdol Wakil points out in a message to UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar, the Pakistani side has not given a positive reply to the Afghan government's request to organize special transport for those wishing to return to the DRA. Afghans who have somehow managed to escape from Pakistan describe how the Pakistani authorities and counterrevolutionary groupings detain all those who want to return to the DRA, humiliate them, and throw them in jail. Refugees have to force their way across the border themselves, because official appeals to the authorities result in their arrest, imprisonment, and sometimes even execution. And those Afghans in Iran who try to leave are more likely to be sent not home but to the front, where they are forced to serve as cannon fodder in the protracted war against Iraq.

The constructive proposals the Afghan side has repeatedly made to its neighbors to settle the disputes at the negotiating table have not met with the approrpiate response. The Iranian authorities have refused point-blank to take part in any talks with the Afghan government. As for Pakistan, a number of positive improvements were achieved at the talks with the DRA government in Geneva through the mediation of the UN secretary general's personal representagive. However, BAKHTAR recalls, it was at that very moment that the Islamabad authorities launched a crude propaganda campaign falsely alleging the DRA's "aggressiveness." It had to do this, by all accounts, so as to conclude another militarist deal with the Pentagon.

ECONOMIC AID TO DRA 'PILLAR' OF RELATIONS

PM011425 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 13, 19 Mar 87 p 7

[Herman Ustinov article: "Cooperation To Grow -- Economic Cooperation: Pillar of Soviet-Afghan Relations"]

[Text] Afghan children have their long vacation in winter, and not in summer, like on other places, because most of the schools do not have heating facilities. However, it's not much warmer inside their homes. [paragraph continues]

The children sit with their parents around a small iron stove fed by dry leaves, paper litter, chippings and very rarely by wood, which is being sold in weight like sugar or oil and is not cheap.

The residents of the old and new housing developments of Kabul do not have to suffer from cold. Their four- or five-story houses have central heating. These blocks are built according to the Master Plan worked out by Soviet architects by the Kabul House-Building Combine constructed with Soviet assistance. More and more such blocks are to be built both inside and outside the capital. This is envisaged by the Soviet-Afghan Agreement on Economic and Technological Cooperation signed on January 16, 1987 in Moscow. It embraces such spheres as power engineering, housing construction, irrigation, agriculture, ar ' transport.

Soviet-Afghan cooperation began virtually following the October Revolution and has been quite substantial. As early as the 1920s, Soviet specialists participated in building the first Afghan industrial enterprises, electric power plants, motor roads, helped the local peasants grow new and better varieties of cotton and destroy locusts. During the 1940s-50s, they helped set up a veterinary service, provide Kabul with services and facilities, build mills and grain elevators, and prospected for oil and gas. The 1960s-70s saw major irrigation, electrification, and road-building projects built with Soviet assistance, and also the Kabul Polytechnic Institute was founded and the Kabul House-Building Combine was opened. Under the supervision of architects from Moscow, the Kabul development and Reconstruction Master Plan for 25 years was worked out, and its implementation started.

By the end of 1977, or practically on the verge of the Revolution, 70 major economic projects had been bult in Afghanistan with Soviet economic and technological assistance. They accounted for 60 percent of the all-round industrial output of the state sector of the economy. The USSR helped build 70 per cent of hard-top roads and also 60 per cent of the power-generating facilities.

Other countries also helped. I saw beautiful schools built in Kabul with French and West German assistance. The USA contributed a lot to the development of the irrigation in the country.

However, immediately after the April Revolution, Western countries embarked on an economic blockade of the republic. In June 1979, U.S. Congress officially wound up all assistance to Kabul, including on the already started projects. The USA's allies followed suit and started to scale down their assistance. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and even specialized UN agencies succumbed to U.S. pressure and also turned off the tap.

Moreover, the programme of assistance, which was not always generous, was replaced by the policy and practice of massacre conducted by the external and internal opponents of the April Revolution. The subversive activity of the counterrevolutionary gangs, armed and trained in Pakistan and Iran and then sent to Afghanistan, has caused 40-billion-afghani damage to the republic. They have destroyed over 2,000 schools, more than half of all medical centres, nearly 300 mosques, disrupted almost all telephone lines between Kabul and the provinces, and smashed half of the power-transmission lines.

The Soviet Union and other socialist states did not leave the young republic in the lurch. It is noteworthy that Keshtmand, prime minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, emphasized in his July 1980 interview to L'HUMANITE when condemning the Western economic boycott of his country that its results have been very limited, because the country had received the loans it needed from the socialist countries.

Support came not only in the form of finances. Machine-building and other industrial equipment, oil products, building materials, irrigation and building machines, seeds of wheat and cotton of best varieties, foodstuffs, clothes, household appliances have been sent to Afghanistan from the north during these years. The goods from the Soviet Union are for the most part meant for one or another branch of the Afghan economy, for one project or another. In return Afghanistan has supplied the USSR with traditional export items such as cotton, raw hides, wool, dried fruits, nuts, olives, raisins, and pomegranates.

Today, perhaps, each socio-economic programme in the republic is based on Soviet scientific, technological, and material help. The Soviet-assisted construction of national industry, raising of agriculture, development of health-building, education, and housing construction are being carried out according to long-term plans, on a wide scale and with a great deal of thought.

Take irrigation, which is a major branch of the Afghan economy. The country, with the exception of the highlands, is arid. From April till November, it lays under a torrid blue sky free of a single white spot of cloud. Two or three snowless winters in a row is a quite usual occurrence for those parts. Needless to say that the country badly needs large modern hydraulic structures.

While in Afghanistan, I met Mohammad Shah Sorkhabi, the country's minister of irrigation, and his Soviet adviser Arkadiy Vasilenko. The three of us became friends. Many Soviet-Afghan joint irrigation projects have been handled by Vasilenko. His father worked in that country as chief Soviet expert at the construction of the irrigation system. As for Vasilenko Jr, he has worked at all the major irrigation complexes of the country, including the Jalalabad Irrigation Complex, during his three long-term business missions in the country.

It should be noted that far from everyone in the republic was aware of the unbreakable interdependence between water and land even after the Revolution. During the first stage of the land reform, the poor peasants received only the land that formerly belonged to the rich. The communal water ditches, even whole local irrigation systems, as well as the water from the state-owned canals, remained in the possession of the local lords who used this to line their pockets.

Arkadiy Vasilenko, as a major Soviet expert on irrigation in the early 1980s, put all his weight behind convincing the republic to radically change its attitude toward irrigation. In 1982, the Revolutionary Council adopted an important decree on water, making it henceforth an asset of the people. Soon after, the Ministry of Irrigation was formed. Local water agencies were set up in the provinces. The ministry sent hundreds of young people to the USSR to learn their trade there. Study courses and technical schools appeared in Kabul. A large-scale reconstruction work of old irrigation networks, general repair of peasants' water ditches, and designing and building of big irrigation complexes have been launched.

"Irrigation would be non-existent in the country but for Soviet help," Sorkhabi told me. "Detachments of our irrigators operating in the 29 provinces have exclusively Soviet-made equipment. More than 50 Soviet specialists are working with us, they are members of the designing, building and maintenance groups, experts at major construction sites and operating facilities. They help quickly set up the irrigation industry in Afghanistan. We decided to restore and put in order the local systems for irrigation of 500,000 hectares annually during the current (1986-1990) five-year period. We also plan to put to use 10,000 hectares of newly-irrigated lands. These are enormous plans, but they are based on precise calculations and strong guarantees of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan." This can be said by any minister of the Republic.

WESTERN DIPLOMATS ACCUSED OF SMUGGLING DRA ART

PM311231 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 24 Mar 87 p 1

[Report by TASS special correspondent V. Ponomarev, written especially for SOVETSKAYA KULTURA: "Kabul: Return of the Treasure"]

[Text] The historical and cultural treasures discovered by Soviet Customs in a foreign transit freight shipment at Brest Station are being returned to the Afghan people from whom they were stolen by embezzlers of the DRA's national property.

Commenting on this decision, 'Abdol Qader Ashna, member of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the State Committee for Culture, emphasized that preventing the illegal export of Afghan antiquities to the West is a practical contribution by the Soviet friends to the consolidation of Afghanistan's national culture fund.

We experience every day the Soviet Union's sincere concern for the preservation of the Afghan republic's cultural and historical heritage, 'A.Q. Ashna said. With the Soviet comrades' help we have managed to organize our exhibition work, which was extremely neglected until recently, and to open a National Museum. Some 22,000 various antiques, discovered by Soviet specialists during excavations at (Telya-tepe), which translated means "Golden Hill," are now being exhibited in the DRA. Every single item found was handed over to us, without anything being concealed -- in contrast to the foreign archeologists who worked there previously and plundered the Afghan people's property. The Committee for Culture recently acquired an ancient stone carving from the Kushana Kingdom era. It was accidentally discovered by a group of Soviet servicemen from the Limited Contingent of Armed Forces in Kabul's Kheyr-khaneh district.

It is no secret that many citizens of Western countries, considering themselves representatives of the civilized world, embezzle the republic's national property in violation of laws passed in the DRA. Taking advantage of diplomatic privileges, a number of staffers from Western missions in the DRA resort to the illegal exportation of objects of our national pride from the country. All sorts of Western dealers sneak among us pretending to be journalists and remove historical and cultural valuables from the countryside by deception. There are tens of thousands of antique items in the regions where those dushmans who still reject the call for national reconciliation are operating. Their gang leader Ahmad-shah is feverishly plundering his own people and is hurriedly exporting valuables abroad.

We perceive in all this, 'A. Ashna noted, not only intrigues by Western shady dealers but also a coordinated policy by Afghanistan's enemies. Nonetheless, and despite the undeclared war forced on us by the West, we have succeeded in recovering and returning to the people more than 2,000 valuable works of art.

The National Gallery and the Ethnographic Museum have been revived in the DRA with help from Soviet friends. The National Archive has been augmented, and it now contains ancient manuscripts and various historical printed works which are also under the state's protection. This archive safeguards 12,000 manuscripts and about 120,000 historical documents. Many of them belong to human culture as a whole. Some manuscripts have also been taken from smugglers trying to export them to the West.

Now, 'A. Ashna said in conclusion, it has been decided to create a few more museums. The collection and purchase of exhibits for these new museums from the population will be undertaken by agitation and propaganda groups from the Committee for Culture, which are being sent to all of the country's provinces to explain the goals and ways of national reconciliation. This course offers the Afghan people the prospect of revived and flourishing culture and art in the country.

GORBACHEV REPORTEDLY TO VISIT CSSR 6-8 APRIL

AU302036 Paris AFP in English 2031 GMT 30 Mar 87

[Text] Prague, March 30 (AFP) -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev will make an official visit to Czechoslovakia on April 6-8, well-informed sources here said Monday.

The Soviet leader will spend the first two days of his visit in Prague and hold talks with Czechoslovak officials before going on to the southern city of Bratislava on the third day, the sources said.

Loginov on Gorbachev Visit

AU030919 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 1 Apr 87 p 7

[Moscow dispatch by RUDE PRAVO correspondent Lubomir Kazda and CTK: "Untapped Potentials Still Exist; Vadim Loginov's Discussion With Czechoslovak Journalists on Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev's Forthcoming Trip to Czechoslovakia;" -- passages within slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] /The forthcoming visit by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Czechoslovakia will undoubtedly become a new strong impetus to the all-around and dynamic development of our mutual relations, Vadim Loginov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, declared in Moscow on 31 March in a discussion with Czechoslovak journalists accredited in Moscow./

He drew attention to the fact that Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the CSSR will be taking place in a special international situation, in which the USSR along with the other Warsaw Pact member states are taking fundamental steps to meet Western positions halfway in the name of initiating and continuing the process of genuine disarmament. /Comrade Loginov voiced appreciation for the initiatives of the CSSR and the GDR to set up a nuclear-free zone in the center of Europe/ as well as a zone free of chemical weapons. He further recalled the Budapest appeal of the Warsaw Pact member states, the Soviet proposals to eliminate medium-range misiles in Europe, and other steps aimed at progress in promoting security, trust, and international cooperation.

The assignment of the Vienna consultations is to work out a mandate for future negotiations on reducing armed forces and conventional armament in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. What has taken place in Vienna thus far was a clarification of positions, but the contours of criteria are gradually emerging, on the basis of which it might be possible to base future negotiations. There are also differences -- the Warsaw Pact member states, for example, propose that these negotiations be held within the framework of the all-European process, whereas the NATO countries demand that only member states of military blocs take part in the talks, that is, that they take place without the neutral and nonaligned states.

For the final resolution of the problems of disarmament it is immaterial, Vadim Loginov said, which forum will be discussing them. However, we regard the opposition to the participation of neutral states.

As far as the socialist states are concerned, their talks on coordinating their foreign policy are marked by a free exchange of views, which also has been confirmed by the recent session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states in Moscow, Vadim Loginov said. The scheme of foreign political activity is a democratic one, with a common policy line and individual initiative as its constituent parts.

Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to the CSSR provides a significant opportunity for a further exchange of views on the development of Czechoslovak-Soviet cooperation in all areas, V. Loginov said. There are great untapped possibilities in this respect. Our countries' potentials must be used more effectively for the benefit of their further prosperity. We take a great interest in the experience Czechoslovakia has gained in its economic activity, public life, and the democratization of society, the representative of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said. The agenda of Comrade Gorbachev's visit comprises not only talks, but visits to industrial and agricultural enterprises. His stay in the CSSR will undoubtedly become a further impetus to the development of mutual relations.

Vadim Loginov described the structure of the exchange of goods, which is not commensurate with the standard of the two economies' development, as the weakest element of Soviet-Czechoslovak economic cooperation. He said that this was the reason for the expansion of the possibilities for exchanging goods, which have until now been solely in the hands of the Ministry of Foreign Trade. /Enterprises can themselves decide what is most beneficial for them./ The existing forms for exchanging goods will continue, but priority must be given to new forms, he stressed.

At the same time, he emphasized the importance of enriching each other's experience. What matters is not the mere exchange of experience, but primarily its implementation. This assumes topicality, in particular, with regard to the development of partnership relations, which have at times taken the shape of some sort of "political tourism," evolving into visits that did not yield the expected benefit.

One example of a collective use of experiences is the Comprehensive Program of Scientific-Technical Progress of CEMA Member Countries Through the Year 2000, Vadim Loginov declared. As far as the restructuring of the CEMA mechanism is concerned, we are now in the stage of preparing its legislative base -- the member states exchange their views at the level of governmental plenipotentiaries. We hope that this process will result in the drafting of a mutually acceptable document, on the basis of which CEMA will change its structure and the mechanisms of its activity. A session of the CEMA Executive Committee could then be held in May or June to assess the document and submit it for discussion to a CEMA session at the level of heads of government, which is to take place in Moscow in July this year, the deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs said.

BRIEFS

HUNGARIAN FRIENDSHIP SOCIETY -- In Moscow's House of People's Friendship today, the central leadership of the Soviet-Hungarian Society held its regular session. On the agenda were the election of the new chairman of the central leadership and the approval of the planned events connected with the marking of the 42d anniversary of Hungary's liberation in the Soviet Union. In the course of the debate, Academician Georgiy Smirnov, alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee, director of the Marxism-Leninism Institute that functions alongside the Central Committee, was elected Chairman of the central leadership of the Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Society. Smirnov takes an active part in the cooperation of the Soviet-Hungarian Social Sciences Mixed Committee an has visited Hungary as a member of various delegations. [Text] [Moscow International Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 30 Mar 87 LD]

ADDITIONAL REPORTAGE ON THATCHER OFFICIAL VISIT

Thatcher, Sakharov Lunch Talks

LD311328 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1226 GMT 31 Mar 87

[By Chris Moncrieff, PA chief political correspondent in Moscow]

[Text] Mr Andrey Sakharov, the 65-year-old freed Soviet dissident, met Mrs Thatcher in the British Embassy in Moscow today and told her: "Two years ago you could not imagine sitting around a lunch like this." Afterwards Mr Sakharov, who was released last December after seven years internal exile, spoke freely to reporters outside the embassy in the full glare of the Kremlin opposite.

Mrs Thatcher, who had invited him and his wife Yelena Bonner, said as she left ahead of them "it was a very nice lunch." When Mr Sakharov, a tired and worn figure, emergd 10 minutes later with his wife on his arm, he spoke only in Russian to waiting reporters "We discussed human rights, people locked up in psychiatric hospitals and people in labour camps," he said. "We want through the arms discussion and there was no disagreement between us on the step-by-step approach to disarmament."

Mr Sakharov, asked if he thought the process of freeing dissidents was going fast enough, replied: "It is going to be a gradual process. About 100 are free, which is a huge event and very important for us." Mr Sakharov added: "The process of democratisation in the Soviet Union is very important for our country . Without it development is impossible. It is also important for the whole world." He was impressed by Mrs Thatcher's "clarity and honesty".

Earlier, a British Embassy car had difficulty in finding Mr Sakharov and his wife, who were waiting to be picked up outside their flat. Mr Sakharov surprised the occupants of two other cars by trying to get into them, mistaking them for the embassy car, which eventually found them.

The meeting with Mr Sakharov, the 1975 Nobel peace prize laureate whose exile was lifted in December by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, took place on the fourth day of Mrs Thatcher's visit to the Soviet Union. Yesterday, she described lengthy talks with Mr Gorbachev as "very good" while British sources said they were "frank and vigorous but never hostile." Mrs Thatcher told the Soviet leader in a Kremlin speech last night that the West would have more confidence and trust in him if he met fully his human rights commitments and if he withdrew Soviet troops from Afghanistan. She also pressed for an agreement to eliminate medium-range missiles from Europe, with restraints on shorter-range systems. Mr Gorbachev suggested the West was trying to "comouflage" its intentions by increasing the number of missiles in Europe and he attacked the levels of unemployment and homelessness in the West.

Today, however, the two leaders chatted as if last night's fiery speeches had never been mad, when they watched a number of Anglo-Soviet deals being signed. One agreement involved development of Anglo-Soviet space research, with the possibility of a joint unmanned probe to Mars in the next decade.

Ryzhkov-Thatcher Talks

PM011509 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 87 First Edition pp 1, 4

[TASS report: "Conversation in the Kremlin]

[Text] On 31 March, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov talked with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

They pointed to the usefulness of the current British-Soviet exchanges of views on a broad range of international problems, issues of bilateral relations, and the interrelationship between political relations of states and the possibilities of developing extensive trade and economic cooperation between them.

Normalization of the international situation would make it possible to channel extra resources and efforts to tackling many pressing economic and social tasks facing mankind.

It was not the policy of nuclear deterrence from the viewpoint by which Britain's Conservative government looked at international relations, but the termination of the arms race and other counsistent measures to strengthen East-West trust that constituted the best guarantee of security for all peoples, Ryzhkov said.

The hope was expressed that the British prime minister's visit to the Soviet Union would promote better understanding between the two countries on fundamental issues of the international situation and facilitate their economic, cultural and other ties.

Margaret Thatcher showed interest in matters of humanitarian cooperation that, in her opinion, should be directed at increasing human contacts, raising the level of information about one another, and familiarizing peoples with life in the respective countries with a view to consolidating trust.

Nikolay Ryzhkov stressed that an active exchange of information, dissemination of the ideas of peace, and better knowledge of each other's life would contribute to a considerable extent to strengthening the spirit of cooperation in Soviet-British relations, and that the Soviet Union adhered to a constructive stand on all these issues.

We do not understand, however, when many mass media bodies in the West and even statesmen are seeking to distort the image of the Soviet people and smear the Soviet reality.

The participants in the conversation considered in detail issues of bilateral trade and economic relations.

Nikolay Ryzhkov expressed confidence that given goodwill and effort on both sides, it would be possible to increase substantially bilateral trade, which was noted by Mikhail Gorbachev during his stay in Britain in December 1984.

The Soviet side came out with specific ways to attain the objective. Margaret Thatcher's attention was drawn to the fact that various kinds of restrictions and discriminatory measures employed in the West, Britain included, with regard to trading with the USSR, hindered that growth.

It was also emphasized that the extent to which British proposals were competitive against proposals coming from other countries was an important condition for reaching practical agreements on several issues currently being discussed between Soviet organizations and British forms.

For her part, Margaret Thatcher reaffirmed Britain's interest in the further development and extension of trade and economic ties with the Soviet Union and said that her government would actively facilitate the realization of measures directed at attaining this objective.

The prime minister also noted that restructuring in the British industry carried out in recent years was creating conditions for enhancing its competitiveness in the world market.

Explaining that the restructuring of the economic mechanism in the Soviet Union was opening up great opportunities for business circles in the West to develop trade and economic ties with the Soviet Union, N.I. Ryzhkov particularly singled out the significance of the active use by British firms of new forms of cooperation -- coproduction, establishment of joint enterprises, research and development by scientists from both countries.

He expressed the hope that the British Government would assist in the implementation of many useful Soviet-British agreements that had been recently concluded.

The sides agreed to carry out practical measures to increase the volume of reciprocal trade and further broaden economic relations on a mutually beneficial basis.

The conversation was held in a businesslike, constructive atmosphere.

Taking part in it were, on the Soviet side: Comrade Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Tolstykh, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology; Comrade Aristov, minister of foreign trade; Comrade Kovalev, first deputy minister of foreign affairs; Comrade Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Great Britain; and on the British side: Howe, secretary for foreign and Commonwealth affairs; Cartledge, great Britain's ambassador to the USSR, Wicks, principal private secretary to the prime minister; and other officials.

UK Commerce Office Inaugurated

PM311901 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 87 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Both Countries"]

[Text] The British-Soviet Chamber of Commerce opened its representative office at the World Trade Center in Moscow 31 March.

The Chamber of Commerce, which groups hundreds of British firms and dozens of Soviet foreign trade organizations, has an important role to play in broadening business ties between the USSR and Britain. Its 71st annual assembly held recently has identified further opportunities for extending bilateral trade, economic, scientific and technical contacts.

Speaking at the inauguration ceremony, Margaret Thatcher underlined the traditional character of trade relations between the two countries. She recalled that the first British commercial representation in Moscow was established some 400 years ago. The Muscovy company meant to develop British-Russian trade was founded then.

The opening of this office of the British-Soviet Chamber of Commerce in Moscow, the prime minister said, was planned during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Britain. "He said we should aim to increase our two-way trade by 40-50 percent. I supp t this idea. But we shall have to work hard for this."

This morning, the head of the British Government continued, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and I agreed that reciprocal trade could reach 2.5 billion rubles in 1990. We are confident that an increase in British-Soviet trade would serve to enhance trust between the two peoples.

Attending the inauguration ceremony were Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Boris Aristov, foreign trade minister of the USSR, Leonid Zamyatin, ambassador of the USSR to Britain, other officials, and the British statesmen accompanying the prime minister.

M. Thatcher visited the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Crystallography.

During her visit, the guest was accompanied by Academician G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

'Broad' Dialogue With Gorbachev

LD011735 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 1 Apr 87

[Text] We begin with a commentary by Aleksandr Druzhinin on the outcome of the Anglo-Soviet talks just over here in Moscow.

The talks have demonstrated above all that the two nations, each with an economic and political system of its own, can conduct a broad dialogue. The Soviet Union and Britain have different political systems and different ways of life. Their approaches to many problems are also different. However, this did not prevent Mikhail Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher to candidly state their respective stands and candor paves the way to mutual understanding. Such dialogues are necessary in relations between all countries because they increase trust. Power politics, relying on strength are no alternative to dialogue because reliance on armed force in this nuclear age is a shortcut to a holocaust and there is no denying that.

It would of course be naive to expect that the Moscow talks would lead to mutual understanding in all areas. The talks showed that Britain, just as other members of NATO, continued to adhere to the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. It sees nuclear arsenals as a guarantee of peace. But is that notion entirely without fault? It's impossible to build a lasting peace on nuclear stockpiles. The building up of the nuclear missiles forces the other side to take measures in response, escalating the arms race further and increasing the threat of a military conflict. Would it not be far more reasonable to take the choice proposed by Moscow and abandon nuclear arsenals altogether and make big cuts in armed forces (?and) conventional weapons? There would be no need then to deter anyone. There would be no need either to base relations with other countries on the threat to use force.

Some Western countries claim that nuclear weapons are necessary to protect them against what they term communist expansion. They also say that the Soviet Union's intention to press for a triumph of socialism arouses fears. Is it reason to suspect this country of aggressiveness? The Soviet Union's goal is a world free of nuclear or any other wars. We are for a triumph of socialism indeed but we press for it relying on ideas rathe than the force of weapons of war. We rely on the force of our own example. We are not out to impose our system on those who do not like it. We are convinced of the advantages of our own system and that system has demonstrated them on many occasion. (?Let) peaceful competition demonstrate that we are right, that is our stand.

Speaking at a dinner in honor of the British prime minister, Mikhail Gorbachev called the Soviet approach to international affairs an invitation to competition with any social system. This country is prepared to contribute on equal terms to setting up an appropriate machinery for that peaceful competition. That machinery must develop and promote trust and an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence. Is that not an example of new political thinking? The world faced with the threat of a nuclear holocaust badly needs that new political thinking now.

Moscow TV Interviews Thatcher

LD010011 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1910 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Interview with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher by Boris Kalyagin, political observer for Soviet television and radio; Tomas Kolesnichenko, PRAVDA international news editor; Vladimir Simonov, political observer for the NOVOSTI press Agency; in Moscow on 31 March replacing World Today program; Thatcher speaks in English with superimposed translation]

[Text] [Kalyagin] Madam Prime Minister, allow me first of all to thank you for finding the time to meet us and to answer our questions. Allow me to introduce to you my colleagues, Tomas Kolsenichenko, PRAVDA international news section editor, and Vladimir Simonov, political observe for the NOVOSTI press agency. My name is Boris Kalyagin. I am a political observer for Soviet television and radio.

Madam Prime Minister, we have a lot of questions for you, of course, but I would like to start with the most important. Your talks with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and conversations with Soviet leaders have ended. What conclusions have you drawn from these meetings and conversations?

[Thatcher] First, I am most grateful to Mr Gorbachev for having given so much time to me. We had talks for 7 hours and had discussions for 2 hours over dinner. I think that the discussions were most wide-ranging. When he came to London we also expected our discussions to be frank [otkrovenyy] and prolonged. Very often discussions held between leaders are formal. Mr Gorbachev and I do not have such conversations. Our discussions during this visit have passed in a frank atmosphere. I now have a better idea of his hopes. I can see what a serious task is posed in the restructuring of your society. We wish you all the best in this matter; we hope that you will succeed. We also discussed various regional problems. The point is, foreign policy has a bearing on domestic policy. We cannot be isolated from foreign policy. Of course, we spent very much time discussing arms control. First and foremost we are striving for peace; that is the most important thing, but we want to have peace in order to live the way we wish within the framework of secure borders. Thus it is not just a question of saying that there will be no nuclear weapons -- We want to guarantee peace. We need to have the ability to defend our country, to defend ourselves from attack.

We had very good talks. We also discussed matters of trade and cultural ties. I hope that this will lead to more frequent contacts, because as yet few people come to us from the Soviet Union. The more understanding there is, the better it will be for all of us, and the more open society is, the greater trust there will be in each other.

[Kayagin] Was this just an exchange of views on various issues, or can we speak of some concrete results from your meeting?

[Thatcher] Concrete results....First of all, we signed several agreements: an important agreement on the so-called hotline, the telephone link that enables us to contact each other immediately, and an agreement on cultural ties. We hope that more people will now be able to go from one country to the other. We signed a number of agreements on trade, which are most important. These are detailed agreements. I think that the most important matters that we discussed were the issues of arms control. In this area, we more or less agreed on an approach to medium-range missiles. We hoped that there would not be such missiles, but they were deployed over here, and we responded with the Pershing and cruise missiles. We wanted them all to be eliminated not just in Europe, but worldwide. That would be the optimum outcome, but for the time being, we could agree on the zero option for Europe and to 100 units in the eastern part of the USSR and the same number of missiles in the United States. That is what we had to agree on. We also will have to have additional talks on shorter-range missiles. We recognize that.

We also have had special discussions on chemical weapons. We in Great Britain destroyed these weapons sometime at the end of the fifties, so we do not have chemical weapons. The United States does not want to modernize its chemical weapons, but the Soviet Union has them, is modernizing them, and has large stockpiles of these weapons. This naturally gives rise to great anxiety among us, and it was therefore most agreeable that Mr Gorbachev accepted our proposal regarding inspection [inspektsiya] to make certain that these weapons have been eliminated, so that we would know that they had been eliminated. You know that after the end of World War I, during which chemical weapons were used with terrible results, everything possible was done to prevent them appearing in World War II, that is arms control.

[Simonov] Madam Prime Minister, I would like to ask you what specifically Great Britain intends to do to improve the international situation, to strengthen general security?

[Thatcher] Just like you, we believe that every country has the right to defend its security. Defense is the only means allowing us to be sure of security within our borders. You have the Warsaw Pact, we have NATO. We have held talks on this matter. There is a proposal concerning the reduction of the quantities of nuclear weapons. We ourselves believe in nuclear deterrence and I will tell you why. Conventional weapons did not prevent two world wars during this century, and when we had conventional weapons we had a struggle around the world to be the first to obtain nuclear weapons, Hitler or us. If he had obtained those weapons, then the results would have been horrific. I think that there has never been a more significant factor of deterrence than nuclear weapons. Anyone who starts a war knowing that nuclear weapons exist also will know the consequences. I think that it is precisely for this reason that we have had peace in Europe over the period of the past 40 years. Peace, freedom, and justice are weighty concepts, and they are guaranteed by nuclear deterrence. At the same time, one can dream that at some time in the world there will be no nuclear weapons, but information and knowledge cannot be destroyed, just as the fact that nuclear weapons exist cannot be erased. For this reason, we will continue to believe in a certain measure of nuclear deterrence. However, we would like a reduction in the quantity of nuclear and chemical weapons and we must strive toward some sort of balance in conventional weapons.

[Kolesnichenko] I would like to raise the question of nuclear weapons. You say that it has kept the peace for 40 years. But, don't you see, we have already been on brink of war more than once -- nuclear war -- in those 40 years, and sometimes we were saved only by chance. In general, nuclear weapons are developing: at first they threatened cities, then countries and continents, and now all humanity. Mrs Prime Minister, is this not madness to rely on nuclear weapons as a guarantee of peace?

[Thatcher] In my view, you and I are saying the same thing. If you are saying that we were on the brink of war several times, but that war did not break out, then perhaps one of the reasons for this was indeed the fear of nuclear weapons. I believe that conventional weapons are also terrible, and that they do not allow war to be prevented, did not allow the war to be prevented in which the Soviet Union suffered dreadfully. If a new conventional war started, then there would still be a competition for who would be the first to obtain nuclear weapons.

For example, if a country where there is a tyrant, a fascist ruler knows that in starting war there are no prospects of winning because the other side has nuclear weapons, it is probably better. So it seems to me there is something more important, namely keeping the peace. If we can keep peace, it is only by means of deterrence, nuclear deterrence.

[Kolesnichenko] You know, we can take the road leading to the destruction of nuclear weapons, and we can take the road leading to the reduction of conventional weapons. Actually, we are proposing this; from the Atlantic to the Urals, there is the proposal. The Warsaw Pact made it concrete in Budapest. Why not solve these two problems instead of putting them in opposition to one another?

[Kalyagin] Apart from that, allow me to add....

[Thatcher, interrupting in English with "Can I just answer this one first?"] Europe in this century has been disfigured as a result of two world wars. The Soviet Union lost millions of people. In World War II in the USSR there were many conventional weapons, but this did not prevent Hitler from starting war. Conventional weapons have never been able to prevent war. Since nuclear weapons appeared, no one can risk starting a war. Allow me to ask you: What do you prefer? The absence of war because of the existence of nuclear weapons? Or do you prefer not to have nuclear weapons, but to keep the danger of another war breaking out with the use of conventional weapons? I have no doubt how you will answer me. I value peace, freedom, and justice before everything, and since I believe that nuclear deterrence hinders anyone from starting a major war, I think that nuclear deterrence must be maintained. Apart from this there is another reason for small countries like ours. Nuclear deterrence is the only means allowing small countries in effect to stand up to big countries. On the basis of conventional weapons, this simply cannot be done. A small country, if it stands alone, can stand up to a big country if it has nuclear weapons. You ask why I put the question like this. Historically, Great Britain had occasion to stand alone. Hitler occupied all of Europe, and we were alone. The United States had not yet entered the war and Hitler had not yet attacked the Soviet Union. We have this experience. We were alone. [words indistinct as many speak at once]

[Kalyagin] Do you think that there is a chance of an accidental occurrence of nuclear conflict? Time goes on; nuclear weapons are being perfected [sovershenstovovatsya]; the possibility increases of an accidental outbreak. We already are reaching the stage where it is not political figures who can solve this problem, but computers that will decide. The flight-time of a Pershing-2 from the territory of the FRG to Soviet soil amounts to only 8 minutes. Imagine an accidental launch of such a nuclear missile. Who will be making the decision?

[Kolesnichenko] It could even be a computer error.

[Thatcher] There are more nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union than in any other country. You have more ICBM's and warheads than in the West. You began to deploy [razmeshcheniye] medium-range missiles. We did not have them. You have more operational-tactical missiles, and you say that there is a danger of an accidental occurrence of nuclear war. I think that you and we know how dangerous these weapons are. In the course of 40 years we have had a sort of safety mechanism [zapasnoy mekhaizm] which has operated on your side and on our side. You probably have more experience in this field, whether the weapons are in the ground or in the air or at sea. We know this from history.

I want to tell you, conventional arms and conventional missiles are also dangerous weapons; they can also be launched; chemical weapons, all weapons are dangerous; it would be wonderful to have none of these weapons at all. However, this can only happen given great trust in each other. This means a far more open society.

Allow me to say the following: Since World War I, which ended in 1918, there has been no instance of any of the democracies attacking one another. That is why we believe in democracy. You want to get rid of the instruments of war. It would be very good if this were to happen, but we must trust each other. The Soviet Union has displayed very great caution, possessing on its side huge stocks of weapons.

[Simonov] Mrs Thatcher, surely this doctrine of nuclear deterrence is based on a policy of threat, and if this threat...

[Thatcher, interrupting in English] Based on a -- I'm so sorry -- based on a policy of...?

[Simonov] Threat... and if we do not from time to time -- or if certain people, who believe in this doctrine -- make this threat conform to reality by certain actions, then the threat can cease to operate. Thus, does it not seem to you that the doctrine of nuclear deterrence essentially invites the side that believes in that doctrine to use nuclear weapons at some time, in order to assert this threat from time to time?

[Thatcher] Surely a policy of using conventional weapons, bombs, missiles, aircraft, submarines, torpedoes, tanks, chemical weapons, surely all this is based on the possibility of using threat? If there is an invasion of some country, then will weapons really not be used on the basis of the concept of threat? Surely the existence of certain weapons is a guarantee of avoiding threat. You have so much weaponry. Mr Gorbachev tells me that the Warsaw Pact is based on the concept of defense. In NATO we stated at the start of the eighties that we threaten no one, that none of our weapons would be used unless an attack is launched against us. So we rely on weapons for defense, and we say that those who have plans to attack us -- let us hope that they do not -- will not win.

[Simonov] I think that your parallel with conventional arms does not withstand criticism, insofar as when we talk of nuclear weapons we are practically speaking of suicide -- even of the side that attempts to use nuclear weapons. I think that, yes, I think that you and I simply have different points of view, Madam Prime Minister, but on this problem allow me to go on to the next...

[Thatcher, interrupting in English] One moment, no, no, no!

[Kolesnichenko, interrupting] I would like to add to this question, if it is possible. We understand your point of view on the point of nuclear weapons. We, by the way, now, when we discuss, for example, missiles in Europe, as far as we know the Soviet Government does not broach England's nuclear forces; however, the disarmament process is proceeding. There were accords at Reykjavik as you know. They can now become treaties. The disarmament process is proceeding. But, all the same, at what stage does England mean to join this process, or do you not mean to join it?

[Thatcher] Let me first of all deal with the first point. You said atomic, nuclear weapons, were suicidal. Yes, they are indeed the most reliable means of deterrence; that's why we have these weapons, and you have more of these weapons than anyone else. Why? Because they are such a powerful deterrent that no one will ever dare attack you. They enable you to uphold the peace. I don't think you need such a large quantity of weapons for use as a deterrent. So it is necessary to achieve their considerable reduction.

As for intercontinental missiles, it is necessary to reduce them by at least 50 percent. I told Mr Gorbachev that. You first sited medium-range weapons. We did not have those weapons. We asked you to remove them. You did not do so, and we sited ours in response. Now we are advocating their liquidation, and then we must go on to missiles of lesser range. We have a very great deal of weapons. Let's take it step by step and gradually try to reduce the amount of these weapons. That would be the best for the whole world.

We will get to the stage when nuclear deterrence is not needed and when we can make better use of our resources. I would like us in 5 years to have a 50 percent reduction in ICBM's. We have only four atomic submarines. That is 2 and 1/2 percent of what you have.

Yes, let us first reduce strategic weapons, then medium-range weapons, then chemical weapons, and then let's take a look at conventional weapons. You have much more of those weapons, tanks, and planes, and so on. Let's get a balance here as well. Then no doubt we will be able to achieve real progress and everyone will be happy.

We publish all our information about defense potential. We have a more open society, and if you are going to have a more open society, and if you are going to have a mmore open society, too, it will be the better for everyone.

[Kalyagin] To return to your words about the need to reduce strategic nuclear weapons. Well, first of all, I do not entirely agree with you. Or, to be more precise, I do not agree at all when you say that the Soviet Union has more nuclear armaments than any other country in the world. I think it has been established that between our country and the United States there exists military parity; in one field they have more, and in another field we have more, but on the whole we are equal. But that is not the point.

[Thatcher] The question is how you are counting: launchers or warheads, because for each launcher there are six or so warheads.

[Kalyagin] They have more cruise missiles, 50 percent. I agree, but the fact is, as Reykjavik showed, in the way of such a radical reduction in armaments stands the Strategic Defense Initiative which destabilizes the situation in the world. How can we give up one class of weapons just so a new, no less powerful one can appear? How do you view this problem?

[Thatcher] First of all, the Strategic Defense Initiative is in the development stage so far. Any new class of weapons calls forth a new method of defense. First it was the bow and arrow, shield and so on; thus it would be very strange not to try to develop some defense against a new class of weapons. The Strategic Defense Initiative so far is in the research stage. The United States is not alone in doing research in this field. The Soviet Union has perfected an antiaircraft defense system around Moscow, recently it was updated. You have 30 years' experience in developing countermeasures against missiles launched against you. We were worried in the seventies when you started developing ray weapons, laser weapons. You have probably far outstripped us in this.

So you, yourselves, have mounted great development work in the field of antimissile defense. You have the world's only operational antisatellite system in the world. I don't know why you are lumping everything together. Nuclear weapons are, yes, the most terrible weapons, and what you are proposing is not to have any defense against them. Perhaps one should have some defense, say for planes. If such a defense can be developed it would be a good thing, but if someone penetrated the defense, the threat would remain all the same. I continue to maintain that nuclear weapons are the most successful deterrent that we yet know against a new war and this has enabled us to keep Europe free of wars. For me, the most important thing is peace. I don't understand why you concentrate only on abolition of nuclear weapons. It is peace I am after.

[Kolesnichenko] Excuse me, we have already understood your concept of nuclear weapons, your attitude to them. That's why we went on to the question of SDI. You called it a program of defense, research. It it's a research program, why has the Reagan administration already gone over to the so-called broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty, a treaty that, as you know, does permit the system around Moscow that you spoke of? But this treaty does not permit testing [word indistinct] absolutely the deployment of systems in space.

Now, in the broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty they are saying that already in the middle of the nineties, components of the first phase of SDI will be put into space and the whole treaty will be...

[Simonov, interrupting] Demolished.

[Kolesnichenko] Demolished, torpedoed. What do you think of that?

[Thatcher] Look, you're getting very technical. All right, you're asking technical questions, I'll give you a technical answer. It's a technical question. When I first met President Reagan at Camp David in 1984, work on SDI was only beginning. At that time there was no narrow or broad interpretation. These words started to appear after 1985. Now, a question needs to be asked concerning what you have been doing in relation to defense using new physical principles, which is mentioned, as I remember, in the main part of the treaty. This is mentioned in the so-called agreed statement D on new physical principles which did not exist at that time. What you call the broad interpretation of the treaty boils down to the fact that it is necessary to have the possibility of testing our research work before beginning deployment. I can give you an answer based not on the finer points of law but on common sense. How can you hold talks on deployment if you do not know whether something will work? Naturally, it is necessary to carry out research; it is necessary to hold tests. Only after that will it be known whether something can be deployed.

[Kolesnichenko] So you are in favor of the broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty?

[Thatcher] I am for common sense; I am in favor of an interpretation based on common sense. How can talks on deployment be conducted, if it is not known whether your solutions are going to work? If they do not work, the talks will not start.

I am trying to propose the following: to extend the validity of the treaty, the term of its validity is too short. But it is up to you to decide, as long as it is you who participates in the talks, and I am proceeding from common sense. We know, for instance, that the system encircling Moscow works, and that you have updated it. We know that you have an antisatellite system. We do not know whether it works or not and how successfully, but we do not interfere with your tests. We know that you are working intensely on laser technology. We know that you are expert in the field of nuclear technology, and we do not complain.

[Kalygagin] Mrs Thatcher, you must be aware of the fact that this broad interpretation of the treaty, deployment of SDI elements in space, means deployment of weapons in space. That is just another phase of the arms race, when it spread to space. Are you realy supporting such a development?

[Thatcher] Yes. But if you have an antisatellite missiles, and you are the only country in possession of it...

[Kalyagin] We have a moratorium on antisatellite...

[Thatcher, interrupting] You mean that you do not test antisatellite missiles? You are being too technical, much too technical. I would not like to go into as much detail.

[Kolesnichenko] You know, Mrs Thatcher...

[Thatcher] I can tell you that the nuclear weapon is the most powerful weapon that the world has ever known. I believe that it is probably sensible to build a defense against the most terrible of weapons. You have ground-based defense systems already, and you have certain systems that are used against nuclear weapons. The SDI is not a system of nuclear defense; it is a nonnuclear defense system. It is better to have a nonnuclear defense against nuclear attack than a nuclear defense.

[Kalyagin] Do you mean to say that the United States will suspend satellites fitted with laser guns over us, and we should sit quiet and do nothing, that we should cut down our nuclear missiles? That can hardly be imagined.

[Thatcher] How can you start negotiations on any issue if you have not even verified anything, have not made sure that something is going to work? Yes, we know that your system is working and that is being updated and is situated around Moscow. I believe that your antisatellite weapons will work as well. Our viewpoint is that the United States, if they could check how their system is working, to verify that, could conduct talks. You do it yourselves in the Soviet Union. We do not ignore that, as we do not ignore the fact that you were the first to deploy the medium-range missiles, SS-20's.

[Kolesnichenko] But Mrs Thatcher, even Washington does not accuse us of violating the ABM Treaty....

[Thatcher] Please tell me, are you interested in anything else regarding Soviet-British relations? I am interested, for instance, in strengthening trust and friendship. Mr Gorbachev's new proposal is one of the most interesting proposals that I have heard recently: a more open society, new incentives, restructuring -- this is an enormous task.

I believe that it is just an incredible task and we wish you success in fulfilling it. And something else: I believe that we must know each other better. We hope that it will bring its results; we hope that we will be able to reduce weapons -- all varieties of weapons.

[Simonov] You meant those processes that are taking place within the country, our country?

[Kolesnichenko] What we call restructuring.

[Simonov] We would like to hear you tell us in more detail what you think of what we call restructuring.

[Thatcher] First, your society at the moment is becoming more and more open. You are discussing various topics in an increasingly open way. That is also a part of our creed of freedom of speech, religion, relations -- a more open society. You are discussing it in the same way we do. It is becoming easier for you to learn what is going on in reality.

As for restructuring, two paths can be chosen here: Either you have a totally centralized system determining what and how to produce and how much it is going to cost; but it does not generally bring the best results, as you have found, because you do not pay people for better work. On the other hand, you can have a society with incentives. The more you work, the more you earn. It must be recognized that people work not only for their country, but also for their families. They want a higher standard of living, and if they see that it is worth working, they will work better.

There are many theories, poliltical theories. I would like there to be fewer of them. No matter what kind of theory you adhere to, no one, no computer would be capable of taking into account all conditions in a country as large as the Soviet Union, all the specific features of the various republics; all aspirations and interests of the people cannot be taken into account. It is necessary to do something to disperse the responsibility among people in various republics, towns, and regions, to give people more responsibility, to give them more incentives. As I understand, that is what you are doing, and it is natural that it is up to you what course of action to take; we will not interfere.

[Kolesnichenko] We want to use all the advantages of the socialist system for our restructuring. But I have another question to ask you. Mrs Thatcher, at one time you were minister of education...

[Thatcher] Would you please say what that meant? You tossed out quite a provocative comment. What do you think are the advantages of a socialist society? We have a ...

[Kolesnichenko, interrupting] I am saying that we want to use in restructuring the advantages of our socialist system that (?we happen to have) here.

[Simonov] In particular, its planned nature.

[Kolesnichenko] Among other things its planned nature.

[Simonov] For an economy this is a great advantage.

[Kolesnichenko] Combining local planning with centralization and local freedom with centralized planning; there are many things there. [as heard]

[Thatcher] I think I just wondered because I....

[Kolesnichenko, interrupting] But I have another question to ask you. Mrs Thatcher, you were minister of education once and we now are also doing a very great deal in the field of restructuring higher and secondary education. Could you tell us how these problems now stand in your country, in Britain?

[Thatcher] We want to introduce some changes into our education system. We are now investing far more money into this area. We have more teachers in relation to the number of students than before. At the same time, we see as before that so far the level of education is not high enough. Some do not have sufficient knowledge either of their language and literature, or of fundamental science. We want to improve the teaching process.

We want people not to give up, say, scientific subjects in school before they are 16. We have a system that already has been subjected to changes. I don't know whether we now have the best results. On the whole, children in our country study in primary schools up to the age of 10. There are large and small schools. From these schools they go on to other, larger schools. This takes place at a very sensitive age in childhood. It has always seemed to me that parents would not want their children to go on to such large schools because in a small school they can better adapt to the new conditions. In some schools we have a small number of students, 100 to 150. We want to preserve this system.

[Simonov] Excuse me, because this question is rather personal. It is said that you literally are addicted to work; that you are one of those people who in English they call workaholics. I have read somewhere that you literally sleep 5 hours per 24. Sometimes you don't have time to have breakfast. You are content with a cup of coffee and a vitamin C tablet. Is that so? What is your daily routine? How strenuous do you find being prime minister and simultaneously remaining a housewife and a mother of two children?

[Thatcher] I have worked hard all my life. That is the way I was brought up in my family. It is necessary to work hard. This is the only way to achieve something. My work is very interesting, and I like it. At first I trained as a pharmacist, then as a lawyer. Then I took an interest in politics. Yes, indeed, I can for a long time sleep only 5 hours per 24. After that, it is true, I need some rest. Don't forget that our political system is a very tough, severe system.. I represent a constituency in Parliament. As a member of Parliament, I also have to attend the Parliament sessions. As Prime Minister, I answer questions in Parliament twice a week. I never know beforehand what these questions will be. They can cover all areas of government activity. I need to work hard every day in order to know how to answer some or other questions. Otherwise I will find myself in a difficult position. After such answers, I make a statement in Parliament and then I am asked questions by members of Parliament and the public. They want to know what is taking place in the country.

We hold Cabinet meetings. I head these meetings. I head the Defense Council and the Economic Council. Usually I go on a tour of the country. I try to do this once a month and perhaps even more frequently. I address businessmen and visit hospitals and schools. I see how things are there. Being a politician, one needs to know a great many things. Sometimes I have ten or even more different events. Sometimes I start complaining that this is too much and then I reduce their number to eight. But this is also a lot.

You have to work all the time. For me this work is the most interesting thing I have ever been occupied with. How do I cope? Indeed for my breakfast I have only coffee, vitamin C, a very light lunch, and if I have to answer questions, I sometimes simply eat fruit or drink juice. One has to concentrate very hard when answering questions, and if you have eaten heavily then the blood flows to the head, making it difficult to answer questions. We have an apartment at 10 Downing Street, which is where the Cabinet of the prime minister is situated. Ministers come to me and bring me various documents and papers. My assistants work together with me. After 10, they all leave and I continue to work. I like this very much. I have worked that way for 8 years and gradually I am acquiring more and more experience and I don't want to do anything else.

[Kalyagin] Now, Madam Prime Minister: I worked as a correspondent in Britain for several years. I know that British people would very much like to know more about our country, and are particularly interested in art, literature, and our way of life. Unfortunately, I have to say that until recently, they have had very few opportunities to find out more about our culture, our modern culture. Do you think that your visit will help to expand our cultural contacts and commercial and economic ties?

[Thatcher] Yes, I hope so. We have concluded several agreements on trade. This will help to eliminate the problem of unemployment in our country. Many years ago I saw a performance by the Bolshoy Theater in London, with Galina Ulanova performing. A few days ago I had the opportunity to go to the ballet Swan Lake. We hope for wide cultural exchanges. We hope that children from our two countries will visit each other more often.

You know that Britain has a fairly high standard of living and it is rising; we are working very hard on that. We have a somewhat different approach to house construction: 64 families out of each 100 own their own homes. I want us to reach the figure of 75 families. We have very good health care. We are building new hospitals. The education system is excellent: in some places it is good, in others not so good. Unfortunately, we do have unemployment -- I don't ignore that problem. When technological changes come, unemployment rises. The level of unemployment we have is now falling, but when people become unemployed, they receive benefits. They receive more benefits if they have larger families. Sometimes they even get more benefit than people actually earn from working. They receive benefits as long as they are unemployed. Once they have been unemployed for 6 months, we look at each specific case -- we either try to find work for them, or we train them for a different occupation. Thus we are trying to solve our problems, and we are striving to reduce the level of unemployment gradually, so that the unemployed might have a sufficiently high standard of living.

Our arts are flourishing, our science is well developed, so I can tell you that we have a rich cultural life.

[Kalyagin] Nevertheless, of course, I would think that the 3 and 1/4 million unemployed would probably like to have work.

[Simonov] Yes.

[Kolesnichenko] Your visit has aroused great interest in the Soviet Union. Our newspaper PRAVDA is getting many letters and telegrams for you, and I brought one of them with me when coming to meet you. Allow me to read it out loud. This is from the Chigirev family, of a mining foreman on the Samarskaya pit, Pavlogradugol, and Chigireva, a shop worker in the same town, and their grandchildren, Ruslan and Elmira.

Dear Madam, my family is glad to see and hear you once again in our country. I am sure that you love life and are prepared to prolong it. We know of many great British people who have done a great deal to improve people's lives on earth, but the British Government has not always been like that. We never again want to fight to be the first to the grave. Let us fight for peace. May you always be young, With cordial respect, Chigirev... and the signatures. That's the telegram...

[Thatcher, in English] I didn't quite get that...

[Kolesnichenko] That is one of the telegrams that came for you.

[Thatcher] Thank you so much for the words of greeting. You want peace and I want peace. You know that every country must be ready to defend itself to keep peace. We recognize the equal rights of every country to this. We want to achieve this while having fewer weapons than at present. We also want you to come and visit us more often, because we think it is very important to strengthen friendship and trust between peoples of the Soviet Union and the peoples of Western Europe, and in particular with the people of Great Britain. I have very much liked my visit to your country. I have very much enjoyed the warm welcome given to me. I will never forget it, and I hope that I will be able to see Soviet people far more frequently in our country. I hope that we will be visiting you more frequently. Thank you for your kindness. Let us hope for a better future for all of us.

[Kalyagin] The time for our interview is drawing to a close. Allow me, Madam Prime Minister, once again to thank you for the far-reaching conversation and for the thorough answers you have given us. I hope that your answers will allow our people to better know your point of view and the views of your government. Thank you.

[Thatcher] Thank you. I am extremely grateful to you.

Thatcher 31 Mar Address

PM011651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Speech by M. Thatcher"]

[Text] I have had one of the most interesting and intensive [nasyschchennyy] visits since becoming prime minister, M. Thatcher declared. She was speaking on 31 March at a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists in the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center.

First of all, I would like to thank Mr Gorbachev and the Soviet Government and people who accorded me such a warm reception. I will never forget the enthusiasm of those Soviet people whom I met.

I certainly came to the Soviet Union at a most interesting and important time. I received some very interesting information from Mr Gorbachev in the course of our detailed conversations. In all probability, I have hardly ever had such lengthy conversation with any other world leader. Seven hours of official conversations yesterday, and two more hours during the dinner. We have an opportunity to meet again over a private dinner, during which we will continue our conversations.

During my meeting with Mr Gorbachev in December 1984, I said that I could do business with him. Yesterday we succeeded in doing a lot of business. I think that if you spend a long time with someone, you understand very well what he wants, in what he believes, and what his objectives are. I hope that Mr Gorbachev shares this opinion.

We all believe in frankness [otkrovennost]. We had numerous opportunities to speak frankly with one another yesterday. Our talks covered a very broad range of questions. We discussed the advantages of our political and social systems. Mr Gorbachev gave very detailed information regarding the policy of restructuring in the Soviet Union. I welcome this process. Everything that will help to make the Soviet Union a more open society will help to build trust.

We conducted a detailed exchange of opinions on the question of arms control. We agreed that first of all it is necessary to approach the question of an agreement on medium-range missiles under strict verification and that it is necessary to limit shorter-range missiles. It is necessary to discuss the question of these systems in greater detail during the talks which will begin right afterward. The main disagreements remaining between us are linked with the fact that the West must have the right to build up to the level of the Soviet Union, and with the question of which systems will be discussed during the talks on short-range [maloy dalnosti] missiles.

I must say that we are not prepared to agree with the idea of a nuclear-free Europe. We agreed that the question of a ban on chemical weapons should be examined first. The United Kingdom has made important proposals on this problem. Mr Gorbachev clearly pointed out that, broadly speaking, the Soviet Union accepts our approach. Both sides want an early start of talks on reduction of conventional arms.

With regard to the proposal to reduce strategic nuclear arms by 50 percent, the Soviet Union links it with limitations on the U.S. SDI. I submitted several proposals regarding the achievement of greater predictability in this area, and Mr Gorbachev will examine these proposals.

Although I do not want to underestimate the difficulties that remain, we have agreed in practice that progress in arms control will only be achieved by a stage-by-stage approach, when priority tasks are precisely defined, when they are defined jointly. I see this as a useful and positive step. It goes without saying that in general I have been inspired by the talks with Mr Gorbachev. But we were unable to achieve a great deal of progress in arms control.

We discussed other world problems too, including, of course, Afghanistan. I told Mr Gorbachev that I favor a neutral, nonaligned Afghanistan. But, of course, this could only happen as a result of the speediest withdrawal of Soviet troops.

We also discussed the problem of human rights. I welcome what has been undertaken in this area. Mr Gorbachev said that specific cases will continue to be examined with due attention. As far as possible, they will be resolved positively.

I regard this as the key to achieving greater trust.

Today we have examined bilateral questions, particularly the problem of trade. I agreed with the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers that we must strive together to ensure that trade turnover between us reaches R2.5 billion by 1990. This would enable both sides to increase their exports by 350-400 million pounds sterling.

To this end, Mr Ryzhkov gave me a list of goods which could become export and import items. As you know, in recent days British companies have signed a number of important contracts and written declarations of intent.

Finally, I want to say that, at the moment, this visit is giving me a great sense of satisfaction. I think that Mr Gorbachev and I have established a very good relationship and that we will be able to continue to conduct the frank dialogue we began two years ago. We now have a better understanding of what the other side is trying to achieve. I was able to say how much we welcome the policy of openness, restructuring, and democratization. It is paving the way to greater trust, which will be necessary for an agreement in arms control. That I was able to obtain explanations on a number of my questions on arms control and that we agreed on the need to achieve progress as soon as possible on the question of an agreement on intermediate-range missiles and on banning chemical weapons gives me special satisfaction.

Replies were given to journalists' questions.

On the same day, M. Thatcher gave an interview for Soviet television.

Space Cooperation Agreement

PM021355 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 87 Morning Edition p 4

["Agreement between the USSR Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Cooperation in the Area of Research, Exploration, and Use of Outer Space for Peaceful Purposes"]

[Text] The USSR Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (hereinafter referred to as the "contracting parties"),

recognizing the advantages of international cooperation in space exploration and the use of outer space for peaceful purposes and striving to make their contribution to the further strengthening and development of such cooperation,

desiring to deepen scientific knowledge through space exploration for the benefit of both countries' peoples and all peoples in the world,

believing that such cooperation in space would be an important step in the cause of establishing European scientific cooperation,

taking into account the provisions of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, signed on 27 January 1967,

expressing satisfaction with the contacts already established between the appropriate organizations of both countries in the area in question,

In accordance with the agreement between the USSR Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the development of economic, scientific, technical, and industrial cooperation signed on 6 May 1974,

and for the purpose of further developing mutually advantageous cooperation between the two countries

have agreed as follows:

Article 1

In accordance with the laws and regulations in effect in each country, respectively, the contracting parties will encourage scientific cooperation between the two countries in the area of the research, exploration, and use of outer space,

Article 2

Cooperation within the framework of this agreement also will cover scientific areas of space exploration, such as solar physics and geophysics, planetology, high energy astrophysics including X-ray astronomy and ultraviolet, submillimeter, and infrared astronomy, radio astronomy, materials science, space biology and medicine, and other spheres which may be mutually agreed from time to time between the contracting parties.

Article 3

Joint measures within the framework of Article 2 of this agreement can be implemented in some or all of the following forms:

a) the establishment of exchanges of scientists and other specialists and assistance in participation in joint exploration and planning work determined by scientific and other research organizations;

b) exchange of experience, scientific data, and literature;

c) cooperation in the implementation of joint projects on the design, creation, and launching of apparatus;

d) the holding of joint symposia; and

e) other joint measures which may be agreed between the two contracting parties.

Article 4

Scientific data acquired while conducting joint experiments will be available to both contracting parties and will be transmitted in the shortest possible time.

Article 5

The program and conditions of cooperation in the fields envisaged by Articles 2 and 3 of this agreement will be determined by working protocols. These protocols will determine in particular the appropriate financial conditions.

Article 6

Each contracting party will designate an appropriate organization which will be responsible for the practical implementation of cooperation programs within this agreement.

Article 7

This agreement comes into force on the date of its signing and will remain in force for an initial period of 10 years. Subsequently, it will remain in force with the condition that each contracting party will have the right to give notice of its termination within a 12-month period, such notice coming in force at the conclusion of the initial period or at any other time thereafter. Following the termination of this agreement, any projects covered by working protocols under Article 5 of this agreement will be continued until their conclusion.

In witness thereof the undersigned, duly authorized by their corresponding governments, have signed this agreement.

Completed in Moscow on 31 March 1987 in two copies, each in the Russian and English languages, with both texts being equally authentic.

For the Government of the USSR: E.A. Shevardnadze

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Nothern Ireland: G. Howe

Culture, Education Accord

PM021317 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 87 Morning Edition p 4

["Memorandum on Mutual Understanding Between the USSR Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Regarding New Avenues of Cooperation in the Areas of Information, Culture, and Education"]

[Text] The USSR Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

desiring to strengthen bilateral cooperation and better mutual understanding and trust between the peoples of both countries,

aware that the development of new avenues and forms of cooperation in the areas of culture and education and the broader and freer dissemination of information will further these goals,

noting the positive experience of years-long cooperation in these areas on the basis of bilateral Soviet-British agreements on ties in the sphere of science, education, and culture,

proceeding from the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and the final document of the Madrid meeting of representatives of CSCE countries regarding cooperation in the humanitarian and other spheres,

having reached the following mutual understanding:

1. The sides will strive for broader collaboration in the information area. They welcome the development of contacts between journalists and press and information organs. They will encourage direct accords between newspapers and journals for the purpose of exchanging articles and their publication.

2. The sides will encourage the mutual exchange of television and radio programs and will assist direct contact between television and radio broadcasting organizations, and between those who prepare television and radio programs in both countries.

3. The sides will assist in making their press and audiovisual information media available to citizens of the other country, including by means of encouraging their appropriate television and radio companies to organize joint discussion programs, "television linkups," "phone-ins," and other similar programs.

4. Recognizing the contribution to the cause of deepening mutual understanding, expanding knowledge of one another, and building confidence between the peoples of the two countries, which can be made by the objective presentation of information in programs on their territories.

5. The sides have decided to organize annually, beginning in 1987-1988, a public lecture on social, economic, cultural, or political subjects. The lecture will be given by famous public figures, a Soviet lecturer in Britain and a British lecturer in the Soviet Union, in turn. The host country will organize publication and will assist coverage by the information media.

6. The sides note with gratification the existence of prospects and specific proposals to expand exchanges in the area of culture. They will assist the practical preparation for and holding of events futhering broader familiarization with each other's cultural and historical traditions and the deepening of the Soviet and British people's knowledge of each other. For this purpose, they will encourage direct contacts and cooperation between organizations and institutions involved with culture and art and between cultural figures. They will assist the organization of reviews of documentary movies and other materials about one of the countries for the public of the other. They note the opportunities for deepening the knowledge of one another offered by arts festivals (music, theater, poetry, cinematography, and other festivals), including those organized by one country in the other. They also note the possibilities provided in this area on the occasions of important dates in the two countries' spiritual, intellectual, and cultural life, and jubilee anniversaries of eminent figures of culture, literature, and art.

7. Recognizing the contribution made by exchanges of intellectual works to the creation of mutual understanding and trust, and striving for the mutual enrichment of cultures, the sides will encourage broader knowledge of literature, dramatic works, music, and art by authors from the other country; for this purpose they welcome the translation, publication, and distribution of books by authors from one country in the other country, the performance of drama and musical works, and the reproduction of art works in their respective countries. They will encourage the further development of cooperation between their appropriate organizations and publishing houses.

8. The sides will encourage the direct exchange of opinions between representatives of art and science from both countries. [paragraph continues]

Noting with gratification the experience of holding "roundtable" discussions between writers, literary collcquia, and other similar meetings, they will encourage the further holding of conferences, seminars, meetings, and "roundtable" discussions between scientists, sociologists, economists, and figures in culture and art, including representatives of the creative intelligentsia, on social, economic, cultural, and other problems of mutual interest. Agreement on holding them will be reached between interested organizations from both countries.

9. Noting the success of past festivals -- a Soviet festival in the United Kingdom and a British festival in the Soviet Union held in Leeds in 1966 and in Novosibirsk in 1978, respectively -- both sides welcome the agreement between the USSR-UK Society and the UK-USSR Association to organize, jointly with other interested organizations, a USSR week in Birmingham in 1988 and a British Week in Kiev in 1990. They express the hope that such festivals will be held on a more regular basis in the future.

10. Noting that knowledge of the Russian and English languages is an important element of cooperation between the two countries, the sides will encourage the border study of the Russian language and Russian and Soviet literature in the United Kingdom and of the English language and British literature in the USSR. They will assist the holding of seminars and colloquia on the methodology of language acquisition and the use of technical facilities in language acquisition in their countries. The sides agreed to encourage the exchange of students and lecturers in the field of linguistics.

11. The sides will promote free and normal access to cultural and information events in their country organized by the other country.

12. The sides will assist the exchange of groups of secondary school pupils for the purpose of familiarizing them with the life, study, and leisure of students in the other country, including meetings in family homes in the host country.

13. The sides have agreed to assist the development of contacts between creative young people in both countries through the encouragement of concerts and performances by young performers, including young people's amateur orchestras and choirs in the other country, the organization of joint workshops for young painters with subsequent exhibition of their work, the organization of seminars and symposia on questions of culture and art attended by young artists and critics, and assistance in other events to be agreed between appropriate organizations in the two countries.

14. The provisions of this memorandum will not prevent either side achieving or encouraging other mutually acceptable exchanges or accords in the areas of information, culture, and education.

The present memorandum comes into force on the day of its signing and will remain in force for a 5-year period. Subsequently, it will remain in force until the expiration 6 months from the date on which one side notifies the other side in writing of its termination.

Completed in Moscow on 31 March 1987 in two copies, each in the Russian and English languages, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Government of the USSR: E.A. Shevardnadze

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: G. Howe

Invitation for Howe to Visit

LD011035 Moscow TASS in English 1018 GMT 1 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS -- In the course of the meeting of Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, with Sir Geoffrey Howe, British foreign secretary, in Moscow on March 31, an in-depth exchange of views was continued, above all on issues in connection with a search for a political settlement of the conflict situations in various parts of the world, the activities of the United Nations organisation and other international organisations.

Eduard Shevardnadze has reaffirmed the invitation to Sir Geoffrey Howe to come on an official visit to the Soviet Union. The date of the visit is to be agreed upon through diplomatic channels.

Arbatov on Thatcher Arms Stand

LD012004 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1930 GMT 1 Apr 87

[Text] There could be a nuclear holocaust if Russian and American thinking on nuclear weapons was the same as Mrs Thatcher's, a leading Soviet foreign affairs spokesman said tonight. Mr Georgy Arbatov, a member of the Central Committee and director of the Institute of US/Canadian affairs, said that the Russian people were appalled by the prime minister's nuclear philosophy.

Speaking on channel 4 news he said: "I think on nuclear issues, and I really never thought I would have to say it, honestly, I think Reagan is more forward looking than Mrs Thatcher is.

"He at least has understanding that he can't, humanity and America can't live, forever with nuclear weapons.

"He understands it is not natural it is dangerous and he has to do something.

"Mrs Thatcher says it is ok she does not believe in a denuclearised Europe.

"If we were to think in the same way, and the Americans were to think in the same way, it opens up the way directly to a holocaust."

Mr Arbatov said that he had heard today from specialists and politicans that they were appalled by Mrs Thatcher's nuclear philosophy. He accused the prime minister of ignoring her advisers. "I think it was transparent in her appearance and speeches on our TV that she even doesn't listen very much to opinions that differ with hers even from her advisers. Maybe they don't dare to say."

'Fabricated' Soviet 'Threat'

LD311539 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1441 GMT 31 Mar 87

["Once Again About the 'Soviet Threat' to the West" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Mar (TASS) -- TASS political observer Sergey Kulik writes:

Those who are attentively following the Soviet-British dialogue at the summit level currently underway in Moscow could not fail to take note of one circumstance. Contrary to the generally known facts, on the initiative of the British side, fabricated allegations have once again surfaced about the Soviet Union's alleged intention to implant communism throughout the world, as well as conjectures that in no way correspond to reality about the "danger of an attack" by the Soviet Union upon Western Europe, which allegedly still remains. In other words, this is once again a case of the myth of the "Soviet threat," which the West uses as a cover-up every time it refuses to accept peaceful Soviet proposals.

Rebutting this quite groundless opinion in his talks with M. Thatcher, M.S. Gorbachev leaned on the philosophical concept of the present-day world as given at the 27th CPSU Congress. It is probably worth recapping the fundamental conclusions of that congress. They testify to the fact that the Soviet Union threatens no one, and that its ideal is a world without weapons or violence, a world in which each people freely selects its own path of development and its way of life.

Moscow works on the fact that the nature of present-day weaponry leaves no state the hope of defending itself through merely military-technical means. Ensuring security, therefore, appears more and more to be a political task, to be solved only through political means. Security cannot be built forever on the fear of retaliation, that is, on the doctrines of 'deterrence.' If we take international relations as a whole, security in our time can only be universal. Under these conditions, the arms race, the desire for military superiority, and threats of force, when viewed objectively cannot bring anyone political gain. The Soviet Union is convinced that the confrontation between capitalism and socialism can proceed only and exclusively in the forms of peaceful competition and peaceful rivalry.

It is precisely upon the bases of these fundamental views of the modern world that the Soviet military doctrine is built. Its orientation is unambiguously defensive. In the military area, the Soviet Union intends to continue to act so that no one has any grounds for fears, even imagined fears, about their security.

The old way of thinking, related to armed force as a means of achieving political aims, and with portraying other peoples in "the guise of the enemy," has already led to two world wars. We should do everything to prevent a third, which, in our nuclear age, threatens to destroy mankind.

Thatcher Moscow Send-Off

PM021049 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 87 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "On Tour of the Country"]

[Text] British Prime Minister M. Thatcher left Moscow for Tbilisi 1 April. She is on an official visit to our country at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

A send-off ceremony for the head of the British Government was held in the Georgiyevskiy Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace prior to her departure.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his wife said farewell to M. Thatcher and wished her a good journey.

M. Thatcher said that she is satisfied with the results of her visit to the Soviet Union and believes that our countries have taken a major step toward the development of dialogue in all spheres concerning both international and bilateral relations.

M.S. Gorbachev said in reply that he also believes that the visit was highly important both for bilateral ties and from the international viewpoint. The visit confirms the desire of both countries' leaderships to conduct a fruitful dialogue and to cooperate in the quest for solutions to topical problems of contemporary development.

The motorcade, escorted by a motorcycle honor guard, made its way from the Kremlin to Vnukovo Airport. The state flags of Britain and the Soviet Union were flying in the streets and squares along its route.

At Vnukovo Airport the prime minister was seen off at the aircraft ramp by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; and other officials.

Taking part in the send-off ceremony were M.S. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR Ministers B.I. Aristov, Yu.M. Volmer, and V.A. Shamshin; Moscow Gorispolkom Chairman V.T. Saykin; and other officials.

Diplomatic staffers of the British Embassy in the USSR were among the send-off party.

The state flags of Britain and the Soviet Union were flying at the airport, and servicemen from the Moscow Garrison formed a guard of honor. An orchestra played the two countries' national anthems.

N.I. Ryzhkov and M. Thatcher inspected the formation of Soviet servicemen.

The send-off ceremony at the airport ended with a march-past by the guard of honor.

M. Thatcher is being accompanied on her tour of the country by V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; USSR Ambassador to Britain L.M. Zamyatin; and British Ambassador to the USSR B. Cartledge.

At Tbilisi Airport, M. Thatcher was welcomed by O.Ye. Cherkeziya, chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

Tours Tbilisi; Dinner; Departs

PM021909 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit Completed"]

[Text] Tbilisi 2 Apr -- On 1 April, British Prime Minister M. Thatcher familiarized herself with the life of the capital of Georgia.

A conversation took place in the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers during which O.Ye. Cherkeziya, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, told the guest about Georgia's socioeconomic and cultural achievements.

M. Thatcher described her visit to the USSR as successful and expressed confidence that it would serve the further improvement of British-Soviet relations. She expressed sympathy to the Georgian people in regard to the natural disaster which had befallen them.

The prime minister laid a wreath at the tomb of the unknown soldier.

M. Thatcher visited the Georgian State Museum and the Palace of Solemn Rituals and toured districts of old Tbilisi.

She attended a concert of the republic's state opera.

On behalf of the Georgian Government, a dinner was given in the prime minister's honor. D.I. Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, and other officials attended the dinner.

In the evening, M. Thatcher left Tbilisi for London.

At the airport she was seen off by V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; O.Ye. Cherkeziya [no title as published]; A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; L.V. Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Great Britain; and other officials.

Among the send-off party was B. Cartledge, British ambassador to the USSR.

Thatcher Remarks on Plane Home

PM030948 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "'Most Valuable Exchange of Opinions'"]

[Text] London, 2 Apr -- British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has emphasized the importance of her visit to the Soviet Union. Talking with British journalists on board the plane on the way home from the USSR, she stated that the talks with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, were the most valuable exchange of opinions she had ever had with any state leader.

According to a REUTER report, M. Thatcher noted that profound differences persist in the USSR's and Britain's approaches to various problems, in particular, questions of arms control.

Speaking of the processes taking place in the USSR, M. Thatcher stated that according to the impression she formed, the leadership's policy enjoys support in the country. The USSR made it clear to the West, she noted, that from the beginning of the process of reforms, Soviet society had reached a turning point "characterized by significantly more openness [otkrytost] and fundamental changes in economic management methods and in other spheres."

Media Comment on Thatcher

PM010951 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Apr 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS 31 March roundup: "Constructive Dialogue"]

[Text] The world public's attention is focused on the detailed discussion of major questions of the time, including the key issue of disarmament, in the course of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and Britain's Prime Minister M. Thatcher, and the speeches they exchanged in the Kremlin. The mass news media and major political and public figures abroad emphasize that face-to-face meetings and frank and constructive exchanges of opinions are necessary in the quest for solutions favoring a safer world.

The British newspapers, television, and radio give paramount attention to coverage of M. Thatcher's official visit to the USSR. The Kremlin talks, the BBC emphasizes, have taken the form of a frank discussion on a broad range of questions, in which arms control problems occupy a special position. Stating that differences remain in approaches to questions like the "nuclear deterrence" policy, regional conflicts, and human rights, a television commentator noted that, nonetheless, "the talks are proceeding in a friendly atmosphere, reviving memories of Soviet-British cooperation during World War II."

"Having examined Thatcher's critical observations on the USSR's domestic and foreign policy point by point, the Soviet leader fully refuted them," REUTER reported. THE TIMES in turn emphasizes that the Soviet side followed up with a "swift, resolute, and most firm rebuff to the attacks against Soviet policy on a broad range of problems -- from nuclear arms to Afghanistan and human rights."

The CPSU Central Committee general secretary, the FINANCIAL TIMES writes, criticized the West's response to the Soviet initiative on medium-range missiles in Europe. He pointed out that this question is being complicated by a whole package of conditions and demands being set before the Soviet Union, revealing slippage by the NATO countries away from their own "zero option" positions.

A U.S. NBC TV commentator noted that the Soviet side dismissed the attempts to link trust in the Soviet Union's proposals on arms reductions with changes in its political system. The participants in the talks, THE NEW YORK TIMES concluded, set out their views firmly but by no means from positions of hostility.

Publishing detailed reports on the Soviet-British talks and the texts of the speeches exchanged by M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher, press organs in the socialist community countries emphasized that in today's world -- a world of a struggle between reason and insanity, between morality and savagery, between life and death -- the Soviet Union has defined its stance clearly and irrevocably: The USSR is on the side of reason, morality, and life.

UK Press Reaction to Visit

PM030946 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 87 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Maslennikov report: "Extensive Commentaries"]

[Text] London, 2 Apr -- All today's newspapers, publishing materials on the completion of the British prime minister's visit to the USSR, quote M.S. Gorbachev's words that the Soviet Union is prepared to continue to expand relations with Britain. [paragraph continues]

There is also extensive comment on M. Thatcher's words prior to her departure for Tbilisi, to the effect that the meetings and talks held in Moscow opened a new chapter in British-Soviet relations.

Many newspapers stress that the further positive development of the two countries' relations could give a powerful boost to the improvement of the situation in Europe and the widening of detente, as is envisaged in the new political thinking propagandized by the USSR. "Thatcher's visit to the Soviet Union," the FINANCIAL TIMES writes in an editorial today, "is an example of the practical detente and willingness to cooperate which lay the political foundations for agreements on the reductions of arms." "Detente in U.S.-USSR relations in the first half of the seventies," the authors of the article write, "was narrowly based on their military parity, but was without the support of a clear consensus among Western political forces as to how to regulate rivalry between the superpowers to avoid friction. This type of consensus can only be built by discussions like those in the Kremlin over the last few days."

Britons Want Missile Solution

LD012014 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Apr 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent Vsevolod Shishkovskiy, identified by screen caption]

[Text] [Shishkovskiy] Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's visit to the Soviet Union and the meetings and conversations that took place in Moscow have helped to strengthen mutual understanding and will certainly have a positive influence on the development of British-Soviet relations. This is virtually the unanimous appraisal being given to these events by the mass information media and Britain's politicians and public figures. [video shows British television screen carrying details of the Anglo-Soviet agreements that were signed]

In reporting the signing of various Soviet-British documents, the newspapers and television have been pointing out the practical measures planned to expand cultural contacts and particularly to further develop economic links. It is being stressed that such links will help to strengthen trust and mutual understanding between our countries. [video shows British television screen pictures of Thatcher and Gorbachev together and then of Thatcher and Howe addressing Moscow news conference]

While positively appraising the frank exchange of opinions in Moscow on disarmament problem, especially on the removal of medium-range missiles in Europe, some observers are drawing attention to the inconsistency of Margaret Thatcher's position on this issue. [video shows British television picture of Neil Kinnock] This has been pointed out, too, by Neil Kinnock, leader of the opposition. It is incomprehensible, he said, how Mrs Thatcher intends to achieve an expansion of mutual understanding and cooperation and, at the same time, is threatening the Soviet Union with nuclear weapons. [video shows British television screen picture of David Owen] David Owen, the leader of the Social Democratic Party, again has spoken about the importance of the adoption of a separate solution on the medium-range missiles in Europe. [video shows more street scenes] This point of view is shared by many people in Britain.

[Begin video interview with in the street with L. Temple, director of the British travel firm Progressive Tours; name and position identified by screen caption; [Temple in English, with superimposed translation] I am glad for the opportunity to say to Soviet television viewers that millions of Britons are sincerely hoping that the results of the meetings and conversations in Moscow will be a strengthening of universal peace and a constructive solution to disarmament problems.

However, I think that the British public indeed has not received a clear answer to the question of whether Britain is ready to actively help a curbing of the arms race and prevent its transfer into space. As for the so-called nuclear deterrent on which Mrs Thatcher insists, it is a constant source exacerbating tension and threatening security. [end interview]

[Shishkovskiy] This is also the view of millions of Britons. They want their country to use all existing possibilities to normalize the international situation and further improve British-Soviet relations.

Thatcher Visit Assessed

LD011717 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1543 GMT 1 Apr 87

[By Chris Moncrieff, PA chief political correspondent in Moscow]

[Text] Mrs Thatcher flies out of the Soviet Union tonight after her most spectacular overseas tour as prime minister. She believes she has speeded up the thaw in East-West relations after four tempestuous days of dialogue with Mr Gorbachev.

In an amazing gesture, the Soviet leader -- through an intermediary -- congratulated the prime minister on her forthright TV interview, beamed to 200 million Soviet citizens on Tuesday night.

Tory MP's will give her an enthusiastic welcome when she appears in the commons tomorrow to describe her historic visit -- during which she startled the men of the Kremlin with her candour, vigour, toughness, and sometimes even downright bloody-mindedness.

Mr Gorbachev responded no less robustly in one of the most astonishing personal political confrontations of the century. And if Mrs Thatcher melted the Kremlin she also left with them the firm impression that here was a woman who could not at any price be compromised. And that, plainly, is the kind of adversary with whom Mr Gorbachev prefers to deal.

For the prime minister, this visit must have enhanced her general election prospects. And although she rejects as unworthy any suggestion that this is an election tour -- "I am on an historic mission for Britain," she asserts -- there can be little doubt that her flawless performance will soon be reflected in the opinion polls.

Events today indicated that Mrs Thatcher certainly now enjoys the official seal of Soviet approval.

First, PRAVDA, the official newspaper, gave the prime minister front page treatment with a prominente picture of her and Mr Gorbachev. It also took the hitherto unheard-of-step of mentioning her private dinner with Mr Gorbachev and his wife Raisa on Tuesday night, describing it as a meeting in "non-official circumstances."

The departure ceremony at the Kremlin this morning was unusual in that Mr Gorbachev's wife was present, another rarity in Soviet protocol. This was seen as demonstrating a special and personal friendliness and cordiality.

Even more significantly, Mr Gorbachev made it known to Mrs Thatcher through Kremlin sources that he took a very positive attitude to her outspoken press conference in Moscow and her equally robust TV interview. Mrs Thatcher told the Soviet millions things they may not have known about the Russian nuclear arsenal. But Mr Gorbachev's response indicated that her uncompromising attitude paid off -- and that the Soviet respect her for it.

She has emerged in the now-softer eyes of the Kremlin as the principal leader of the Western world. Her week in the USSR -- during which she and Mr Gorbachev have in one breath mercilessly attacked each other's principles and, in the next, toasted each other in a spirit of great cordiality -- must have a substantial effect on the forthcoming Geneva disarmament talks. She says she now believes a medium-range nuclear weapons agreement could be reached by the end of this year.

She foresees the gradual easing and growing openness of Soviet society. And she sees a Soviet leader who does not simply say "nyet" like his predecessors, but stands up to argument.

Before leaving for London tonight, Mrs Thatcher said: "The visit has opened a new chapter in British-Soviet relations."

Many people -- herself included -- believe it has also opened a new chapter on a worldwide scale.

Parliament Address on Results

LD022006 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] London April 2 TASS -- British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher made a statement in Parliament today in her visit to the Soviet Union. She expressed gratitude for the hospitality and welcome accorded to her and noted that the most important aspect of the visit was, of course, the very extensive talks which she had with General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

Margaret Thatcher stressed that in the talks on arms control the sides agreed that priority should be given to an agreement on intermediate range nuclear weapons, with strict verification, with constraints on shorter-range systems and with immediate follow-in negotiations to deal more fully with shorter-range systems. Margaret Thatcher again declared that her government would not be prepared to accept the denuclearisation of Europe.

In saying so she claimed that the Soviet Union had superiority in conventional and other forces. "I do not understimate the differences which remain between us," the prime minister said. "But it was nonetheless clear from our talks that we do agree that progress on arms control requires a step-by-step approach with clearly identified priorities, and that we are largely in agreement on what those priorities shall be." "This is a useful and positive step. I am hopeful that a satisfactory agreement can be reached on intermediate nuclear forces by the end of this year."

Margaret Thatcher said that she had visited Zagorsk, toured a new housing development of Krylatskoye [as received] in Moscow and visited Tbilisi. "Wherever I went I was struck by the spontaneous warmth and friendliness of my reception by the people of the Soviet Union." "I believe that augurs well for our future relations."

"My visit," Margaret Thatcher said in conclusion, "took place at a most interesting and crucial moment in the development of the Soviet Union. I firmly believe that it is in our interests to welcome and encourage the course on which Mr Gorbachev has embarked. Our political systems will remain very different and we shall continue to hold widely divergent views on many international problems. But Mr Gorbachev and I were able to discuss these differences frankly in a spirit of friendship." "Mr. Gorbachev expressed the Soviet Union's willingness for wider cooperation with Britain in every field."

EMBASSY IN FRANCE PROTESTS 3 EMPLOYEES' EXPULSION

LD030056 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2335 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Paris, 3 Apr (TASS) -- The USSR Embassy in Paris has today circulated the following statement:

On 2 April, the French side announced to the USSR Embassy in France the decision to expel three Soviet employees supposedly for activity incompatible with their status.

In relation to, a decisive protest was made to the French side, while its decision was described as not having any foundation and as being clearly of an unfriendly nature with regard to the USSR.

The fact worth noting is that the French side did not cite any kind of evidence of the so-called unlawful activity by Soviet representatives, since there was no such evidence and could not be.

The course of this campaign shows that from the very beginning it was thought up as a political provocation directed at casting a shadow on Soviet-French relations and at friendship between our peoples.

The embassy again stated that the responsibility for all the consequences of this action on Soviet-French ties, including for further bilateral contacts, is laid entirely upon the French side.

BRIEFS

FRENCH SCIENTIST DECORATED -- Paris April 1 TASS -- The Soviet Order of Peoples' Friendship has been presented in Paris today to noted French scientist, one of the leading specialists of the National Centre of Space Explorations of France, Rene Pellat. The award was conferred upon the scientist for his contribution to the large-scale international Vega project to explore the Venus planet and the Halley's Comet. Three more French scientists were awarded with the Order of Peoples' Friendship last year for the project-associated explorations. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 1 Apr 87 LD]

LUXEMBOURG CULTURAL, SCIENCE COOPERATION -- Moscow April 1 TASS -- A programme of cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and Luxembourg in 1987-1988 was signed in Moscow today. The programme provides for reciprocal trips of artistic companies, soloists, and workers in culture, arrangement of exhibitions, exchanges and cooperation in education and other spheres. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 1 Apr 87 LD]

TALYZIN ADDRESSES PDRY SOVIET COLLECTIVES

LD021405 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1258 GMT 2 Apr 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Aden: The Soviet party and state delegation, headed by Comrade Talyzin, had a meeting here with the representatives of Soviet collectives working in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Comrade Talyzin delivered a speech to those assembled.

The Soviet delegation departed by air for Moscow today. At the Aden airport it was seen off by Al-Siyayli, member of the Politburo of the Yemeni Socialist Party Central Committee, first deputy prime minister, and minister of the interior of the republic, and other officials.

Departs For Moscow

LD021048 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] The visit to Aden by a Soviet party and state delegation has ended. It is headed by Comrade Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Gosplan. Today the Soviet delegation left Aden for Moscow.

CONTRACTS OPEN 'NEW PHASE' IN TIES WITH EGYPT

PM021345 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

[V. Belyakov dispatch: "Contracts Signed"]

[Text] A number of major contracts have been signed in Cairo between Soviet and Egyptian state organizations, opening a new phase in Soviet-Egyptian economic cooperation.

The contracts envisage constructing a fourth coke-oven battery at the by-product coke plant in Hulwan, which will increase its capacity by almost 50 percent; doubling the size of the refractory materials production plant in Al-Tabinah; and supplying certain types of equipment for the first stage in the modernization of the Hulwan metallurgical combine. All these enterprises were constructed with Soviet technical assistance and still form the basis of the country's heavy industry.

Addressing the contract signing ceremony, M. 'Abd al-Wahhab, Egyptian minister of industry, gave a high appraisal of the USSR's contribution to the development of the Egyptian economy.

MOROCCAN POLITICIAN 'SCORNS' POSSIBLE U.S. BASES

LD022129 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Rabat April 2 TASS -- The Moroccan people shall never agree to the return of foreign military bases to their territory. This was stated by Ali Yata, general secretary of the Progress and Socialism Party of Morocco, speaking in Tangier at a meeting devoted to preparations for the 4th party congress.

The statement was made in connection with the "information being distributed by some circles" that American military bases, located Spain, might be transferred to Morocco's territory. Such rumours were qualified by Ali Yata as "following blindfold the American aggressive plans directed against Arab and African peoples."

PRAVDA NOTES 'TRIPOLI DECLARATION' ON PLO UNITY

PM021351 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

[Tass report: "For the Restoration of Unity"]

[Text] Tripoli, 27 Mar -- The text of the "Tripoli Declaration on the Restoration of PLO Unity," approved by the leaders and representatives of a number of Palestinian organizations, has been distributed in the Libyan capital. The document underlines the need for the restoration of PLO unity on an anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist basis and reaffirms adherence to the political program envisaging fulfillment of the Arab people of Palestine's legal rights, including their right to self-determination and the formation of their own independent state.

The sides favored convening an international conference to settle the Near East conflict and its central problem -- the Palestinian problem. It has been noted that the PLO, which is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, must be involved in the work of this forum as an independent, equal participant. The declaration rejects all capitulationist plans such as the Camp David agreements and the infamous "Reagan Plan."

The document stresses the need to further develop cooperation and strengthen alliance with the USSR and other socialist community countries, and also with nonaligned states.

AFP NOTES MOSCOW 'CONCERNED' BY CHAD SITUATION

AU011408 Paris AFP in English 1356 GMT 1 Apr 87

[Text] Paris, April 1 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union has told France it is concerned over the military situation in northern Chad and threats to its Libyan ally, informed French sources said here Wednesday.

They said this was made known last week to the French Embassy in Moscow by the Soviet first deputy foreign minister, Yuliy Vorontsov.

Moscow is the principal source of weapons for Libya, ally of the anti-government forces in Chad. An authoritative French source estimates Libyan troops in northern Chad at around 8,000.

Recently Libya has suffered reverses: -- the fall of the Ouadi Doum base and also Libya's last bastion in northern Chad, Faya-Largeau.

The Libyans pulled out of Faya-Largeau without too much fighting, but informed Western sources say the fighting at Ouadi Doum was fierce.

The Chad Government forces have set as their next major target the capture of the Aouzou strip in northernmost Chad. Since 1973 the strip has been occupied by the Libyans, who consider it is part of Libyan territory under an agreement signed in 1935. But Ndjamena contests the agreement's validity.

The Aouzou region is said to be under Libyan protection and also under surveillance from bases in southern Libya.

Meanwhile, at Chadian President Hissein Habre's request, France has stepped up delivery of a second batch of military equipment earmarked for Ndjamena. The first batch is valued at 250 million francs (about 40 million dollars).

France, the informated French sources say, is prepared to contribute to a peaceful settlement of the civil war, but having intervened at the request of the legitimate government of Chad, it will only leave the region at that government's request.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA COMMENTS ON CHAD SITUATION

PM021151 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Apr 87 First Edition p 3

["Military-Political Commentary" by V. Vinogradov: "Oil on the Fire"]

[Text] An agreement exists between France and the Habre regime on cooperation with a view to establishing control over Chad's entire territory. This was announced by French Defense Minister Giraud in an interview with the "Europe-1" radio station. And he added: "We are fulfilling this commitment."

So now all the i's have been dotted. After all, previously official Paris, while being drawn increasingly into the military conflict in Chad, would give some obscure explanations of the supply of arms to Ndjamena and the rendering of direct military aid to it, motivating its actions by the need to counter the mythical "Libyan interference." [paragraph continues]

The "fog" has cleared with Giraud's statement. France has set the task of asserting the Habre regime's control over all of Chad, converting this country, with his consent, into a bridgehead of imperialism in central Africa.

As is well known, for several years a dividing line between the Ndjamena troops and the forces of the Transitional Government of National Unity [GUNT] has passed along the 16th parallel. But recently the Habre regime's troops have carried hostilities across this line, to regions controlled by GUNT. It is clear that the Ndjamena authorities would hardly have decided on this crucial step on their own because they did not have adequate means. All the more so since only a month ago, in an attempt to prevent his army's disintegration, Habre introduced the death penalty to the army.

The Western press reports that in the offensive it has undertaken Habre's army has even succeeded in penetrating to a certain depth. The explanation for this should be sought in the sharp increase in military supplies which are arriving for Ndjamena from France and the United States. It is indicative that four foreign correspondents who have reported this were immediately expelled from Chad. A further explanation could be the fact that during recent fighting the GUNT forces have captured several mercenaries from France, the United States, and Zaire who had been taking part in combat operations on the side of the Habre regime.

The intensity of the fighting continuing in Northern Chad can be judged by the fact that Ndjamena has already spent the U.S. military aid of $15 million given to it in December last year. Foreign Minister Lassou was hastily dispatched to the United States. To all appearances he achieved his objective, because Washington has announced that the Habre regime has been earmarked further military aid worth at least $10 million. According to a UPI report, it will include various armaments, munitions, motor transport facilities, and radio equipment. Thus the United States in conjunction with France is continuing to pour oil on the fire of the conflict.

And this conflict is presenting an increasing danger not only to Chad itself but also to its neighbors. French reconnaissance aircraft operating in Chad have begun to invade Sudan's air space. There are reports of an increase in tension in the region of the Chad-Nigeria border. It is no accident that representatives of the five African countries bordering on Chad have decided to hold a joint meeting to discuss questions connected with the threat presented by the conflict blazing there through the fault of imperialist circles.

Voices denouncing the growing interference of France and the United States in Chad can be heard increasingly resolutely in Africa. "The Chadians must resolve their internal problems for themselves," Sudanese Prime Minister al-Sadiq al-Mahdi stated, expressing the will of the majority of the African states. And they can do this under the auspices of the OAU.

TALYZIN RETURNS FROM VISIT TO MOZAMBIQUE

LD021833 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] A Soviet party and state delegation led by Nikolay Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of ministers, and chairman of the State Planning Committee, returned to Moscow today.

The delegation attended celebrations marking the 10th anniversary of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Mozambique at the invitation of Mozambican leaders.

The delegation was met at the airport by Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and other officials.

MOZAMBIQUE TREATY ANNIVERSARY OBSERVANCE NOTED

Leadership Greetings

PM011407 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 87 First Edition p 1

[Greetings message from Soviet leadership bodies to Mozambican counterparts on 10th anniversary of Friendship Treaty]

[Text] To the Frelimo [Mozambique Liberation Front] Party Central Committee

To the Permanent Commission of the People's Assembly

To the People's Republic of Mozambique Council of Ministers

On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation Between the USSR and the People's Republic of Mozambique we sent most ardent and cordial greetings to the Frelimo Party Central Committee, the Permanent Commission of the People's Assembly, and the Mozambican Government and people.

The past decade has convincingly proved the strength and effectiveness of the treaty and has confirmed that it reliably serves the cause of strengthening the friendship and deepening the fruitful cooperation between our countries. Based on the firm foundations of the treaty, Soviet-Mozambican relations today encompass the most important spheres of the life of our peoples and graphically demonstrate what diverse ties can exist between sovereign and independent states if they are based on the principles of mutual respect, equality, and noninterference in one another's internal affairs, accord with mutual aspirations, and serve the strengthening of international security.

Soviet people follow with a sense of invariable solidarity the advance of the People's Republic of Mozambique along its chosen path of development and acclaim its contribution to the struggle of the peoples against the aggressive policy of imperialism and for the final elimination of colonialism, racism, and apartheid.

We are convinced that relations between the Soviet Union and Mozambique will continue to steadily strengthen and develop in the interests of the peoples of our countries and the cause of progress and universal peace.

We wish the friendly Mozambican people happiness, prosperity, and all-around success in fulfilling the noble tasks planned by the Frelimo party.

CPSU Central Committee

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

USSR Council of Ministers

Officials Address Fete

PM021110 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "To Mark the Anniversary"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of the public was held in the House of the Unions 31 March to mark the 10th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique.

On the presidium were A.F. Dobrynin, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations, and members of the Mozambique party and state delegation.

The treaty between the USSR and Mozambique, A.F. Ryuytel, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, noted in his report, has become a firm basis for the development of the entire range of multifaceted ties and cooperation between the two countries and their collaboration in the foreign policy sphere in the interests of the cause of peace and progress. It also vividly expresses the USSR's unchanging solidarity with the Afghan peoples' just struggle for their political and economic independence. The speaker noted the two states' determination to continue to follow the path of deepening and improving bilateral ties.

J. Rebelo, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Frelimo [Mozambique Liberation Front] Central Committee, the head of the Mozambique delegation, stressed that the treaty is an important mechanism for strengthening the two countries' friendship and cooperation. He said that the people of Mozambique welcome the policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Union and warmly support the Soviet peace initiatives.

Gromyko Holds Talks

LD012037 Moscow TASS in English 2021 GMT 1 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received in the Kremlin today a party and state delegation from the People's Republic of Mozambique.

The delegation is led by Jorge Rebelo, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Frelimo party Central Committee.

The Mozambican delegation came to the Soviet Union to attend celebrations marking the 10th anniversary of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Mozambique.

During the conversation, held in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding characteristic of relations between the parties, governments and peoples of the two countries, the sides discussed Soviet-Mozambican bilateral cooperation.

They also exchanged views on some international problems, first of all the situation in southern Africa.

Both sides expressed their commitment to the lofty goals of the treaty.

The very fact of its conclusion between nations separated by several thousand kilometres proved that both countries shared interests that could not be affected by distance if they both strove sincerely towards cooperation and friendship and pursued a policy of peace.

The past decade was a good test for Soviet-Mozambican relations.

Both sides expressed the conviction that issues of internal development of any African or other nation should be handled by the people of that country. No outside force had the right to impose social orders on other peoples.

The Soviet Union and Mozambique were committed to this policy, a policy that fully met principles of the United Nations.

The two sides pointed to the need for cooperation with all nations around the world to prevent nuclear war. Both sides stressed the need to do everything possible to further develop and enrich bilateral Soviet-Mozambican relations, including in economy and trade.

Rebelo handed over to Gromyko a message from Joaquim Alberto Chissano, chairman of the Frelimo party and president of Mozambique, to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

PRAVDA NOTES NEW AMBASSADOR TO ZIMBABWE

PM261437 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 87 First Edition p 6

["Chronicle" report on transfer of Ambassador Glukhov from Bolivia to Zimbabwe]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade Arkadiy Mikhaylovich Glukhov of his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Bolivia in connection with his transfer to other work.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Arkadiy Mikhaylovich Glukhov USSR Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade Georgiy Artashesovich Ter-Gazaryants of his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Zimbabwe in connection with his transfer to other work.

TASS REPORTS CENTRAL COMMITTEE POLITBURO MEETING

LD022017 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1844 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow, 2 Apr 87 (TASS) -- At a session held today, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo heard a report by M.S. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov and E.A. Shevardnadze on the results of their talks with British Prime Minister M. Thatcher.

They noted the great importance of the talks both for bilateral and international relations. Under the new conditions developed in Europe and in the world, dialogue has continued with a major Western power which is a permanent member of the UN Security Council. It provided an opportunity to frankly set forth our views on relations between states with different social systems, on regional conflicts and other important problems and -- what is particularly topical -- on prospects for disarmament. We compared our positions in depth and elucidated each other's intentions.

Agreements were signed on concrete questions of bilateral relations. The hope was expressed that M. Thatcher's visit will be followed by an activation of bilateral economic and cultural ties.

The talks have shown both sides recognize the importance of solving the problem of medium-range missiles, though Britain continues to take an approach toward an agreement hemmed with conditions; they express willingness to abolish chemical weapons, work toward a reduction of military confrontation in Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- enrich the Helsinki process and promote the settling of regional conflicts by political means.

On the cardinal questions of world development, fundamental divergences remain. It was reaffirmed that the Soviet leadership strongly disagrees with the position that the conduct of international affairs and national security are thought reliant nuclear weapons, though this encourages their proliferation and is fraught with universal catastrophe.

The Politburo is convinced of the need to continue and deepen the dialogue with Britain and the other Western states in the spirit of the new thinking, to overcome existing distrust and bring about a healthier international situation.

After having discussed the results of the conference of the Warsaw Pact member states committee of foreign ministers which was held in Moscow, the Politburo supported the steps mapped out by them all aimed at the elimination of the nuclear threat, the banning of chemical weapons, the advancement of the Budapest initiative on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, the development of the all-European process and also at the improvement of the foreign policy interaction of allied states.

M.S. Solomentsev reported on the results of the visit by the delegation of the party control committee attached to the CPSU CC to the People's Republic of Bulgaria. It was noted that the meetings and contacts made during the trip contributed to mutual enrichment through the exchange of work experience of the controlling bodies of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Bulgaria.

The Politburo considered A.I. Lukyanov's information on the visit of the CPSU delegation to Denmark at the invitation of the Social Democratic Party of Denmark, and G.P. Razumovskiy's information on the participation of the CPSU delegation in the proceedings of the Austrian Communist Party congress.

The Politburo has considered the progress of work carried out in line with the program for the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES. It was noted the first two power units of the atomic power station are working steadily and the decontamination of other installations, and populated areas in the rayons subject to pollution is continuing. The construction of residential housing, consumer, and social amenities is being conducted on a large scale for the evacuated population. It has been taken into consideration that additional measures for stepping up the pace of this work, for accelerating the construction of the town of Slavutich and ensuring reliable protection for the water resources during spring floods are being implemented by the appropriate ministries and departments.

The question of measures to bring about a radical improvement in statistical reporting in the country was examined. The importance of this work for the current restructuring of management and the economic mechanism was noted. Fundamental directives were given on ways of further developing statistical reporting and raising the level of analysis of the processes of economic and social development and scientific and technological progress. Attention was drawn to the need to keep statistical information more up to date and to give it greater publicity, to rationalize the rendering of returns, and the need for it to be absolutely authentic. A large role in implementing these tasks is allocated to the further strengthening of the material and technical base of the statistical bodies and an improvement in the training of statistical economist cadres.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined the question of ensuring the protection and rational use of the natural resources of Lake Baykal. A fundamental assessment was made of the unsatisfactory fulfillment of existing resolutions made on this matter. With a view to finding a cardinal solution to the problem, a resolution by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the preservation of the natural resources of Lake Baykal was endorsed. The chiefs of ministries and departments with a relevant interest, local party and soviet bodies, scientists, specialists, writers and other representatives of public opinion took part in preparing that document. A package of organizational, scientific, economic and technical measures was outlined for radically improving the ecological situation in the Lake Baykal basin.

The tasks were set of rearranging production at the Baykal pulp and paper combine and carrying out major measures at other enterprises in the region to prevent the pollution of Lake Baykal and the atmosphere in this zone. It is planned to expand the network of tourist centers here and at the same time to establish conditions for the organization of tourism and the rest and recreation of the population such as to guarantee the preservation of landscapes and the flora and fauna.

The Politburo discussed the progress in the preparation of a USSR bill on the procedure for lodging legal complaints against unlawful acts committed by officials which encroach on citizens' rights. After discussion of the bill in the standing commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, it will be duly submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet for examination. It was stressed that the passing of the law would promote the further development of democracy, the strengthening of legality, and the enhancing of the responsibility of officials.

The meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo also discussed certain other questions of state construction, cadre policy, the development of cooperation with the liberated countries, and the struggle for peace and social progress.

LUKYANOV, OTHERS FILL VACANT SUPREME SOVIET SEATS

PM021405 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Report on the Election of USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies to Particular Electoral Okrugs"]

[Text] Elections of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies in particular electoral okrugs to replace departed deputies were held on 22 March 1987.

The following were elected USSR Supreme Soviet deputies:

To the Soviet of the Union:

Balashikhinskiy Electoral Okrug No 25, Moscow Oblast -- Comrade Vladimir Arkadyevich Brezhnev, USSR minister of transport construction;

Mytishchinskiy Electoral Okrug No 32, Moscow Oblast -- Comrade Nikolay Mikhaylovich Olshanskiy, USSR minister of mineral fertilizer production;

Barnaulskiy Electoral Okrug No 60, Altay Kray -- Comrade Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee;

Cheremkhovskiy Electoral Okrug No 170, Irkutsk Oblast -- Comrade Anatoliy Petrovich Dolmatov, machine operator at the "Rossiya" Kolkhoz, Cheremkhovskiy Rayon, Irkutsk Oblast;

Borovichskiy Electoral Okrug No 225, Novgorod Oblast -- Comrade Ivan Ivanovich Nikulin, first secretary of Novgorod CPSU Obkom;

Dzerzhinskiy Electoral Okrug No 227, Novosibirsk Oblast -- Comrade Lev Dmitriyevich Ryabev, USSR minister of medium machine building;

Zernogradskiy Electoral Okrug No 270, Rostov Oblast -- Comrade Boris Mikhaylovich Volodin, first secretary of Rostov CPSU Obkom;

Balakovskiy Electoral Okrug No 286, Saratov Oblast -- Comrade Nikolay Fedorovich Lukonin, USSR minister of nuclear power generation;

Tulchinskiy Electoral Okrug No 411, Vinnitsa Oblast, Ukrainian SSR -- Comrade Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov, chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST;

Zhdanovskiy-Ilichevskiy Electoral Okrug No 441, Donetsk Oblast, Ukrainian SSR -- Comrade Serafim Vasilyevich Kolpakov, USSR minister of ferrous metallurgy;

Bakinskiy-Nasiminskiy Electoral Okrug No 675, Azerbaijan SSR -- Comrade Yuriy Aleksandrovich Bespalov, USSR minister of the chemical industry;

Panevezhskiy Electoral Okrug No 693, Lithuanian SSR -- Comrade Nikolay Andreyevich Mitkin, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee;

Kalininskiy Electoral Okrug No 717, Kirghiz SSR -- Comrade Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations;

to the Soviet of Nationalities:

Margilanskiy Electoral Okrug No 124, Uzbek SSR -- Comrade Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;

Dzhambulskiy Electoral Okrug No 138, Kazakh SSR -- Comrade Ermek Zhakselekov, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Trade Union Council;

Kustanayskiy Electoral Okrug No 145, Kazakh SSR -- Comrade Aleksandr Vasilyevich Kovtunov, commander of the Central Asian Military District;

Zhdanovskiy Electoral Okrug No 206, Azerbaijan SSR -- Comrade Akhmed Dadash Akhmedov, leader of a composite mechanized cotton-growing team at the Shaumyan Kolkhoz, Zhdanovskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan SSR;

Valmiyerskiy Electoral Okrug No 300, Latvian SSR -- Comrade Vitaliy Pavlovich Sobolev, second secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee;

Tezebazarskiy Electoral Okrug No 443, Turkmen SSR -- Comrade Annamurad Khodzhamuradov, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers;

Charshanginskiy Electoral Okrug No 448, Turkmen SSR -- Comrade Sergey Mikhaylovich Nesterenko, second secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee.

ZAYKOV, YELTSIN, OTHERS ADDRESS IDEOLOGY COURSE

LD021352 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1258 GMT 2 Apr 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A study course for secretaries of the Central Committee of the union republics, kray and oblast party committees and for those in charge of questions of ideological work has ended at the Institute for Raising the Qualifications of the Senior Party, Soviet, and Ideological Cadres of the Academy of Social Sciences attached to the CPSU Central Committee.

They studied topical questions of the Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of communist construction, economic policies, and international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state at the present stage.

Comrades Zaykov, Yeltsin, Yakovlev, Medvedev, Nikonov, Razumovskiy, and other comrades addressed those taking part in the study course.

SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM MEETS; CHAIRED BY GROMYKO

LD292019 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Mar 87

[Text] A sitting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held today in he Kremlin under the chairmanship of Comrade Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. An examination was made of the work carried out by the USSR Ministry of Railways to improve the organization of passenger transport and to enhance traffic safety and the quality of service to passengers. A report was delivered by Konarev, USSR minister of railways. The decision adopted on this issue will be published in the press.

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet then examined the matter of the progress achieved in fulfilling the Supreme Soviet's decision of 3 July, 1985, on the report by the USSR procurator general on the activity of the USSR procuracy in supervising the implementation of the demands of Soviet laws and on strengthening law and order and protecting the rights and legitimate interests of citizens. A report by Rekunkov, USSR procurator general, was heard. It was proposed to the USSR procuracy and local procuracy bodies that they concentrate their efforts on putting into practice the policies of the 27th party congress and the decisions of the CPSU January 1987 Plenum regarding issues of further consolidating socialist legality and expanding publicizing [glasnost], and to take additional measures to implement the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet examined certain other matters of the country's public life. Comrades Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 27 March in its "Vremya" newscast carries a shorter announcer-read report on this session which adds Yeltsin to the list of those participating at this point.] and Slyunkov took part in the discussion of the points on the agenda.

Makes Decision on Railways

LD011310 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Apr 87

[Text] The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has examined the work being done by the USSR Ministry of Railways to improve the organization of passenger transport, traffic safety, and the quality of passenger service. The decision adopted by the Presidium noted that alongside the considerable work being done by the railraod to resolve national economic tasks, the state of passenger transport, which has great social importance, continued to remain at an unsatisfactory level. This problem has become particularly acute on the suburban passenger lines during peak periods of travel, as well as during the weekend. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet charged the USSR Ministry of Railways with reorganizing its activity to ensure that the shortcomings are removed. It has been deemed appropriate to send the decision to the USSR Council of Ministers so necessary measures can be taken.

YAKOVLEV ADDRESSES CPSU MASS MEDIA CONFERENCE

PM020837 Moscow TRUD in Russian 1 Apr 87 p 1

[TASS report: "Conference at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A conference of leaders of the mass media has been held at the CPSU Central Committee to discuss the urgent tasks of the press, television, and radio in the struggle for restructuring.

The gathering was addressed by A.N. Yakovlev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum marked, he said, a fundamentally new stage in the development of society. It not only confirmed the immutability of the party's strategic policy of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development but also deepened understanding of the fundamental basis of restructuring and elaborated approaches dictated by the accumulated experience of restructuring.

The party elaborated the theoretical platform of restructuring and defined the main directions of practical activity. The most important thing today is to translate principles into the language of practice, of living deeds, and of persistent everyday work. Much still has to be overcome -- the chronic adherence to conservatism and the gap still existing between word and deed, between thoughts and practical actions -- and everything still hanging like a dead weight on the living cause of restructuring must be cast aside.

In other words, the braking mechanism created over the years must be smashed without hesitation. This mechanism is complex, multifaceted, and varied, and it has a particularly strong hold on people's minds, acting as a mighty barrier in the way of mastering the new thinking. "Conviction is the mainstay of restructuring," M.S. Gorbachev has said. Without it restructuring cannot be accomplished. This must always be remembered when strengthening faith in our revolution and the April spring and pride in the socialist homeland.

The restructuring process demands special responsibility, competence, and perspicacity on the part of journalists. The further development of democracy is the cardinal task, and the mass media play a very important role in this, developing publicity, openness, and criticism and analyzing the deep-seated restructuring processes.

The mass media are by their very nature called upon to reflect accurately and comprehensively the very complex structure of the interests and opinions of various sections and groups of society. It is very good when our leading newspapers and magazines make their pages more accessible to opinions by organizing debates and "roundtable" discussions of urgent questions of restructuring. True, all this still lacks spirit, constructiveness, and boldness in formulating problems. The old diseases -- superficiality, "idea-phobia," and substitution of didacticism for analysis -- make themselves felt.

The standard of debate is still poor: If people praise, they do so with a lump in their throat, and if they criticize, they do so ruthlessly. It is quite a bad thing when certain editorial offices start hearing just "with one ear" exclusively those who agree with their viewpoint. This is undemocratic. Deafness to the opposite viewpoint is not a sign of health and strength. When one half-truth is replaced by another half-truth, the truth alone suffers as a result. Sometimes there is insufficient good sense, analyticalness, or ability to conduct an interested dialogue with the reader, and haste is also encountered -- which does not attest to a lofty sense of professionalism.

Every magazine and newspaper is a powerful and sharp weapon of democracy. It is public and common to all people, not a personal weapon. Therefore itis inadmissible to use the strength of the printed word to settle personal scores, to impose any group views, or to cover up the truth by spreading certain facts and hushing up others, whatever the excuse. [paragraph continues]

It is undemocratic when openness falls on immoral soil, into the hands of those who seek only personal profit in the pages of newspapers and magazines. As a result, the very stagnation that has already caused many misfortunes is generated.

Finally, a question which should also be spoken of frankly -- the question of veracity and authenticity in journalistic articles. Inaccurancies and factual errors are still frequently committed -- there are many complaints about this. The mass media must struggle to elevate the individual and his dignity, and not disparage him with untruth and injustice.

Nor can it be considered correct when newspaper pages are filled with articles primarily by editorial staff workers, while those chiefly involved in restructuring -- workers, peasants, the intelligentsia -- remain outside the debate. This is undemocratic and does not conform to the party policy of involving the working people most extensively in the restructuring process and in the management of the affairs of society and the state.

The press is doing good work, actively delving into life and into its complexities and contradictions and showing healthy processes and those that hinder them. This is the chief thing characterizing the mass news and propaganda media today. The froth bubbling in the pages of individual newspapers and magazines must also be seen. I am not talking of the sharp, principled, critical articles which are already becoming the norm in the life and activity of the press. The point is that problems of effective restructuring are not always given good, vivid, and accurate coverage in all their seriousness and depth. Assertiveness, thoughtfulness, and analysis are sometimes missing.

Let us take the subject of the construction of projects in the sociocultural sphere. It appears, of course, the economy cannot be enhanced nor the quality of life improved without changes in the social infrastructure. However, little attention is still devoted to these questions. The press does not always show who specifically is to blame for the nonfulfillment of plans and for failures to construct housing, children's establishments, schools, hospitals, theaters, and houses of culture.

Or take a problem such as the development of the cooperative movement and of individual labor activity. Correct psychological approaches are needed in its coverage. This is where good reasoning, openness, principledness, and generalization of the first shoots of experience are needed, the speaker pointed out. Here again routine and inefficiency prevail.

Or take questions such as quality, discipline, the instilling of proper order everywhere and in everything, the molding of the new type of leader, the assertion of the new work style, scientific and technical progress, activities of the local press, and many others. The vivid, sharp, and profound formulation of fundamental problems of restructuring is the chief feature by which the militancy, responsibility, and efficiency of the press may be judged.

The paramount task today is to act energetically in every direction of restructuring, develop openness, criticism, and control from below, augment socialist moral and ethical values, and deepen the revolutionary nature of the current processes, advancing our society toward a new qualitative condition.

PRAVDA REVIEWS NIKONOV VISIT TO MURMANSK

PM010929 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Visit to Murmansk Oblast"]

[Text] Murmansk, 29 Mar -- V.P. Nikonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited Murmansk Oblast 26-28 March. He acquainted himself with the progress of restructuring in the work of agro-industrial complex enterprises, met and talked with fishing industry and agricultural workers and specialists.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited the Murmansk No 2 Bakery and acquainted himself with the work of the enterprise during the night shift. During a conversation with bakery workers, the importance of raising output quality and expanding the range of bakery goods was emphasized. In this work, in addition to enhancing the role of technologists, it is necessary also to enhance the role of all other leaders and specialists. It is also necessary to establish strict supervision of the observance of operational requirements and to ensure that only high-grade goods are delivered to consumers.

In the Murmansk sea fishing port, one of the biggest in the North, V.P. Nikonov met the crew of the "Van Deyk" refrigerator factory ship. Ways to increase the catch of valuable species of fish and to improve processing were discussed. Attention was drawn to the fact that it is impermissible for fish factories to stand idle in ports or fishing grounds and for produce to be less than fully processed.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary also met with workers of the Murmansk fish combine fish smoking and protein concentrate plants and acquainted himself with the experimental section of the "Sevtekhrybprom" Science and Production Association, and the ship repair enterprise association. In conversation, the workers and specialists of these enterprises spoke about the need for the swiftest possible retooling of production facilities with new machinery and equipment and the more resolute tackling of social problems. They voiced specific proposals aimed at accelerating the development of this important sector of the national economy.

V.P. Nikonov visited urban and rural trade enterprises, acquainted himself with the work of one of the oblast's biggest livestock complexes at the Tuloma state farm, and visited the Murmansk greenhouse combine where vegetable crops rich in vitamins are grown all year round and high results -- up to 47 kg of vegetables per square meter of greenhouse space -- are achieved. He also inquired about the solution of social problems in polar settlements V.P. Nikonov acquainted himself with new housing estates in Murmansk and visited the construction site of a plant which will process vegetables and fruit into juices and other vitamin-rich products which the inhabitants of the North badly need and which are still in short supply. At the city's new vegetables depot he noted the high level of mechanization of production processes and organization of vegetable storage. At a local dairy he talked to workers about ways to make more efficient and better use of the valuable raw materials being delivered and to increase the variety and improve the quality of dairy products. The CPSU Central Committee secretary also visited the winter sports stadium in the Murmansk Uyuta valley, where international skiing competitions within the framework of the traditional "Sever" festival are currently under way.

V.P. Nikonov addressed a USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry party-economic aktiv meeting at which the progress of the sector's restructuring in the light of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum was discussed.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary laid a wreath at the monument to the defenders of the Soviet Polar Region.

V.P. Nikonov was accompanied on his tour of the oblast by N.I. Kotlyar, USSR Minister of the Fish Industry; V.N. Ptitsyn, first secretary of the CPSU Obkom; and Yu.Z. Balakshin, chairman of the oblispokom.

PRAVDA UKRAINY ON PLENUM LEADERSHIP CRITICISM

PM011323 [Editorial Report] Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 27 March 1987 carries on pages 1 through 4 under the headline "To Energetically Implement Restructuring, To Work in the New Fashion. From the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum" a 17,000-word RATAU report on the debate at the 24-25 March Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum.

Touching on questions of cadres policy, V.P. Mysnichenko, first secretary of the Kharkov Party Obkom, is reported as follows: "It seems to us, the speaker continued, the Central Committee Secretariat and its sections must show greater trust in local party and soviet organs, especially under the conditions of democratization of cadres policy."

Reporting the speech by I.G. Grintsov, first secretary of the Sumy Party Obkom, RATAU says:

"Speaking of the reasons behind the slow progress of restructuring, Comrade I.G. Grintsov pointed out the fear of taking risks, the fear of shouldering responsibility for possible consequences and mistakes as well as responsibility for independently resolving questions within the entrusted range. An example in this ought to be set by the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. Why not, for example, entrust party obkoms with the final decision on questions regarding the soviet and economic leadership cadres. This would be particularly topical if several, rather than just one, candidates were being discussed."

Yu.N. Yelchenko, first secretary of the Kiev Party Gorkom, is reported to have said:

"The secretaries of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee must keep a considerably keener eye on the work of local leadership cadres to appraise them in a more principled fashion. We have even created the terminology: Sector secretary, secretary in charge of a sector. But why not: Secretary in charge of a sector's cadres?"

RATAU gives the following account of the opening portion of the speech by V.G. Dikusarov, first secretary of the Khmelnitskiy Party Obkom: "I will begin my speech, he said, with some unpleasant events which took place recently in several of the republic's oblasts. I think each one of us asks himself: How could it happen that experienced secretaries, seemingly setting an example for others, have been dismissed with quite harsh words?

"This provides food for thought for each one of us and for the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo. In my view, the unpleasant fate of these officials resulted from the loss of self-monitoring and demandingness toward oneself, from toadying and servility. [paragraph continues]

This is why, no matter how much we may rely on criticism from outside, no matter how much we may speak of its importance, it is still necessary for each one, and primarily for leaders, the first secretaries of party obkoms, to constantly and self-critically analyze their own behavior and actions.

"The Voroshilovgrad, Dnepropetrovsk, and Lvov Obkom plenums make it incumbent upon us to conclude: It is necessary to be swifter and more persistent in implementing the restructuring of the work style of party committees in the spirit of the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum demands."

In the speech by V.M. Kavun, first secretary of the Zhitomir Party Obkom, he speaks of the Central Committee's "important documents on the Voroshilovgrad, Dnepropetrovsk, and Lvov party organizations," and continues:

"It seems all Central Committee members are greatly perturbed by the shortcomings revealed in these oblasts. Frankly speaking, we all are asking ourselves: How could it happen that such phenomena occurred in such major party organizations? There is no question that this became possible primarily through the fault of the party obkom first secretaries who violated the norms of party life. Major responsibility for this is also borne by members of these party committees' bureaus, who took a liberal stance. A certain share of the responsibility must also be shouldered by the Central Committee Secretariat and Politburo and Comrades A.A. Titarenko and V.V. Shcherbitskiy personally. Everything that happened in these oblasts must become a serious instructive lesson for each one of us."

The RATAU report ends with the following account of V.V. Shcherbitskiy's closing speech"

"V.V. Shcherbitskiy delivered the closing speech at the Central Committee plenum.

"I think all participants in the plenum would agree, he said, that the discussion of the most urgent question of the activity of the republic's party organizations proceeded, on the whole, along businesslike and critical lines. The state of affairs in many sections and some of the speeches provide evidence that the comrades are still finding it difficult to restructure themselves, especially regarding economic methods of management and changing the work style. There are many shortcomings in cadre work.

"The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee's practical measures to fulfill the CPSU Central Committee Plenum decisions have been supplemented by numerous specific proposals. Quite a few critical remarks were also made. They will all be taken into account and analyzed in the Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Council of Ministers, and other republic organs. The Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat will do everything possible to implement them more quickly, and will step up the monitoring of execution and cadres' responsibility for overcoming negative phenomena.

"A businesslike and critical tone must also be set when the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum materials are discussed at obkom, gorkom, and raykom plenums and in primary party organizations. This requires a thorough analysis of the state of affairs in every section and the definition of most productive measures, primarily in the context of making good the lag built up since the start of they year. This applies in particular to the machine building complex, light industry, consumer goods production, railroad transport, and the construction industry.

"Our plenum proved stagnation phenomena occur not only in the republic's economic and social development but also in the methods of party and economic leadership. If we speak about restructuring, this means it is primarily necessary to change and improve the methods of our work taking the new demands into account. We all must work harder.

"The tasks to be solved are difficult, very difficult, and time is passing quickly. We must certainly solve them.

"V.V. Shcherbitskiy dwelt on some questions raised in the speech by Comrade V.V. Osipov, commander of the Red Banner Kiev Military District. Last year and this year servicemen carried out colossal work in eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl AES accident and in helping to resolve national economic tasks in winter conditions. They are also participating in the implementation of measures to protect population centers, industrial and agricultural enterprises, and other installations from the spring floods.

"On behalf of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, V.V. Shcherbitskiy expressed thanks to the Army and Navy servicemen and to members of the civil defense formations who successfully resolved and are resolving this task.

"The speakers at the plenum, V.V. Shcherbitskiy continued, emphasized that much work lies ahead of, including work in preparation for the Great October Socialist Revolution's 70th anniversary. The CPSU Central Committee resolution on this matter and the party Central Committee appeal to the Soviet people are of great theoretical and practical importance. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo will determine in the very near future specific measures for organizational and political work in the republic in preparation for the Great October jubilee.

"The best way to celebrate this memorable date will be to achieve new tangible results in the acceleration of socioeconomic development.

"Each member of the Central Committee and all members of elected party organs must set an example in restructuring, display initiative and businesslike efficiency in the solution of current tasks, and make their personal contribution to the fulfillment of plans and socialist pledges."

PRAVDA SUMMARIZES LATVIAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

PM020805 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 87 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent O. Meshkov: "Benefit to the Cause Is the Criterion. Latvian Communists Discuss the Decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum"]

[Text] Riga -- Many of the participants of this republic plenum actively helped to prepare the report delivered by Latvian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary B. Pugo. The Central Committee members were told to express their views and wishes on the process of restructuring in party and economic work and to assess the degree of practical assistance they are getting from the Central Committee. This intensified the analytical nature of the report, gave it a fresh view of many problems, and prompted a frank discussion. More than 20 people spoke, including a worker, a kolkhoz chairman, a teacher, a Latvian Communist Party Central Committee secretary and the chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers, and party raykom secretaries. They talked about urgent matters and sharply criticized shortcomings, not forgetting the grains of experience that restructuring is creating.

The Main Thing Is To Act [subhead]

The Communists have plenty to think about. The republic's economy has yet to achieve the requisite momentum and has not acquired stability. Hiccups in the work of many enterprises and a lack of rhythm, largely associated with failures to meet contract deliveries, led to industry's nonfulfillment of the plan for the first 2 months of the year. The state failed to receive output worth nearly R32 million. One in five enterprises failed to cope with its contract pledges. There was particular concern at the fact that there are still many enterprises in the republic where the prestige of the plant trademark is not cherished and where people have become accustomed to lagging behind. The reasons include complacency on the part of some economic leaders and lack of preparedness for work in conditions of state acceptance. It is bad, speakers noted, to see party organizations adopting a passive stance in a number of cases.

The plenum again raised the question of the Riga Railraod Car Building Plant. For many years it has been producing streetcars which are inferior to similar foreign models in terms of their speed, passenger capacity, and other indicators. It has been developing a new type of car... for 20 years now. The plant leaders must bear the chief responsibility for this. They have done their utmost to ensure a quiet life and have not altered their stance even now, in conditions of restructuring. Is this not indicated by the fact that through their ministry and the USSR State Committee for Standards they got the model they are producing switched from the top quality category to the... basic class (which includes, for example, nails and paper clips) and thus avoided reducing its wholesale price. That is, instead of stepping up the quest for ways of improving quality.

When discussing the state of affairs in the agro-industrial complex, the plenum participants recalled the assessments and advice given during M.S. Gorbachev's stay in Latvia. Many kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the republic have achieved quite good results and modern management is being practiced. This practice is not spreading quickly enough. Can one tolerate the fact that gross output is lagging behind the rate of growth of farms' capital-labor ratio? The available potential is not being fully exploited, for many years now the grain yield has remained static in the republic, and increasing volumes of grain have had to be brought in from outside.

What is inhibiting the growth of meat and milk production? There are many reasons including the fact that the feed ration now includes a smaller proportion of coarse and succulent feed. In some places the existing structure of livestock raising is cited in justification of the large consumption of feed grain and, on this pretext, little is done to strengthen other components of the feed base. The leaders of Rizhskiy and Valmiyerskiy Rayons, for example, have been criticized more than once for this. There were promises that the situation would be rectified, but there are no apparent results so far. Quite rightly, the plenum raised the question of effective monitoring of decisions and greater accountability for errors and mistakes.

Be the Soul of Restructuring [subhead]

This was the plenum's appeal to primary party organizations and party committees. Restructuring will prevail if people are roused to action, stagnation phenomena in various spheres of life are more rapidly eliminated, and there is stronger reliance on the best experience. The specific areas where this experience is to be found were named.

For instance, there is now more concern in the Daugavpils city party organization for increasing the militancy of grass-roots components -- shop organizations and party groups in teams and in sections. Leninskiy party Raykom is seeking to make fuller use of collective experience and involve all members of the committee and a wide range of Communists in the quest for solutions to problems. In may gorkoms and raykoms there has been a move toward concrete work with people and there has been a reduction in the number of matters considered at bureau sessions. The flow of paper from above has markedly abated. The raykom and gorkom first secretaries' school set up at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee is making a useful contribution to restructuring. It pays special attention to studying and then applying the experience of the best party organizations not only in its own republic but neighboring republics as well.

The plenum was uncompromising in its assessment of those who are still living in the past, who have not shaken off the habit of red tape and the "pressure" style of leadership. For example, in Bauskiy Rayon they have not bothered to analyze why there is a widening gulf between frontranking and laggard farms and why adverse trends have emerged in the development of agricultural production. The raykom secretaries and other personnel prefer to operate in the old way: Farm leaders are immediately "carpeted" and always get a "roasting." That is what they call increasing exactingness... The Raykom Agriculture Section also demands primary organization secretaries give written guarantees they will halt the fall in milk yields. As we can see, there is still great faith in the omnipotence of paper!

Criticizing the negative phenomena in cadre policy, the contributors to the debate noted, in particular: It is time to eliminate situations where a leader, to protect his job, stubbornly inhibits the growth of young, enterprising working people. Restructuring must open wide the door to those who can be of more benefit to the cause.

The Force of Democracy [subhead]

The idea that democratization, like a refreshing spring torrent, contributes to the acceleration and deepening of restructuring ran through the speeches. It is apparent in the case of the republic, above all in labor collectives. The collective of the Riga "Kommutator" Production Association was among the first in the country to use the the competitive system for electing leaders. It now has many followers. The election of the director at the "RAF" Plant has won unionwide fame. Today chief engineers, directors and their deputies, chiefs of trusts, VUZ rectors, and other leaders are increasingly being elected, as well as middle-level leaders. More than 5,000 leaders at various levels have already been elected.

Of course, quantity is not the point. The plenum voiced a clear warning against getting carried away with the formal side of things and mindlessly following fashion. Party organizations are called upon to direct this work skillfully and study public opinion more fully. The plenum participants backed the proposal that economic managers at various levels report regularly to their collectives and that in some cases there be a vote: Do the working people trust them to continue to lead the enterprise or construction project?

Discussing problems of the cadre reserve, speakers noted: It is time to "declassify" this reserve, make it open, public, and perhaps elective as well. In fact, there is already substantial experience of this type at the Riga "Radiotekhnika" Production Association. Here the election principle is applied when establishing the reserve. In collectives of not more than 60 people, all personnel participate in the election of candidates for it. The promotion reserve is renewed in this way each year. Let the collective have an important say in all cadre movements, the speakers said.

It was clear from the speeches that not all party organizations have taken the lead in work on democratization and on the development of self-management in production. This is also indicated by the results of sociological research carried out at 32 enterprises in Riga, Ventspils, and Daugavpils by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Party History Institute. It turns out that during last year more than one-half of the Communists did not participate at all in tackling such important matters as staffing teams, planning their work and providing labor incentives, and electing the team council. The plenum ordered a careful analysis of this and the removal of all barriers in the way of increasing people's initiative and the effectiveness of self-management.

Measures were determined to intensify working people's international and patriotic education. It was noted that it is necessary to increase the contribution of social scientists and literary and artistic figures to this work and introduce changes consonant with the spirit of the time into the work of propagandists, information workers, and lecturers.

It is necessary, speakers said, to create a correct mix of leadership cadres of different nationalities and take this into account when training specialists for higher and secondary educational establishments, such as the Latvian Agricultural Academy, the Conservatory, and the Academy of Arts where at the moment there are few students of the nonindigenous nationality. The struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism must be stepped up. A healthy way of life must become the norm for all the republic's inhabitants.

The plenum approved the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum and outlined a specific action program for their fulfillment.

INFORMATION REPORT ON 25 MARCH BELORUSSIAN PLENUM

PM021457 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 26 Mar 87 p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report on Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The Sixth Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was held in Minsk 25 March.

The plenum examined the question "On Republic Party Organizations' Tasks To Deepen Restructuring and Improve Work With Cadres in the Light of the Demands of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum."

The report was delivered by Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

A.A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Minsk Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; A.A. Zelenovskiy, first secretary of the Brest Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; N.V. Granenkova, installation worker and winner of the USSR State Prize; V.V. Grigoryev, first secretary of the Vitebsk Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; A.S. Kamay, first secretary of the Gomel Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; V.I. Ray, chairman of the Zhabinkovskiy Rayispolkom; L.G. Kletskov, first secretary of the Grodno Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; V.S. Leonov, first secretary of the Mogilev Belorussian Communist Party Obkom; A.I. Dutkovskaya, chief animal technician on the Lenin Kolkhoz, Berestovitskiy Rayon, and deputy secretary of the primary party organization; G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet Presidium; L.I. Kiselevskiy, rector of the V.I. Lenin Belorussian State University; N.I. Dementey, secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; A.I. Kovalevskiy, lathe operator at the

Belorussian Motor Vehicle Plant in Zhodino; V.G. Yevtukh, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers; P.P. Goydenko, general director of the "Integral" production association; V.A. Lepeshkin, secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; R.P. Severneva, head of department at the Mogilev city emergency hospital and shop party organization secretary; V.I. Mikhasev, chairman of the Minsk Gorispolkom; I.A. Antonivich, Belorussian minister of installation and special construction work; V.I. Zheleznyak, chairman of the Lenin Kolkhoz, Gomelskiy Rayon; and V.L. Tsivinskiy, first secretary of the Orsha Belorussian Communist Party Gorkom; particpated in the discussion of the report.

M.Ye. Matyushonok, director of the "Dobrovolets" Sovkhoz, Klichevskiy Rayon; N.V. Domenikan, first secretary of the Baranovichskiy Belorussian Communist Party Raykom; V.F. Radevich, first secretary of the Minskiy Belorussian Communist Party Raykom; I.V. Titov, chief of the Glavpolesyevodstroy Main Administration; E.A. Shvedov, first secretary of the Mogilev Belorussian Communist Party Gorkom; and G.A. Vengerchuk, worker at the Berezovo meat cannery; voiced their views and proposals on the problems under discussion into microphones installed in the auditorium.

The plenum listened to a briefing by Belorussian Minister of Internal Affairs V.A. Piskarev "On the Belorussian MVD's Work To Fulfill Party and Government Resolutions on Overcoming Drunkenness and Alcoholism." P.S. Adamovich, chief of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Administrative Organs Section, spoke on this question.

Resolutions were adopted on the questions under discussion.

An organizational question was examined. The plenum elected V.F. Kebich, deputy director of the Belorussian Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic Gosplan, as a member of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and approved N.G. Voytenkov as chief of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Department, releasing A.I. Tishkevich from this position in connection with his reassignment.

G.M. Meshcheryakov, instructor of the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Work Department, participated in the plenum's work.

The plenum materials will be published in the press.

PRAVDA ON ELIMINATION OF ECONOMIC 'GIANTISM'

PM271241 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 87 First Edition pp 1-2

[Article by Vasiliy Parfenov under the"Before CPSU Central Committee Plenum" rubric: "Traveling Light"; first three paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The radical reform of economic management, the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum said, affects fundamental questions of the functioning of the socialist economic system and many aspects of political and social life and work style and methods. That is why it is planned to examine the entire package of these questions at the next CPSU Central Committee plenum.

The PRAVDA editorial office is receiving constructive proposals on ways of improving management, on how to create an effective anti-expenditure mechanism of economic administration. This was stated in particular at the recent session of PRAVDA's business club "The pace and new quality of growth."

Today we publish an item on one of the elements of the anti-expenditure mechanism.

Giant Mania an Science-Intensiveness [subhead]

Nowadays we are doing less and less walking. Yet only 3-4 decades ago people walked a lot. They set off taking only the most essential items. And if they did drive they did not load the cart with inessentials. After all, "if you throw a mitten on a heavy cart the horse won't pull it."

Our present way ahead is not simple either. And if we lighten our load and bring up our straggling string of carts the mighty convoy of our economy will become more mobile, will proceed more rapidly, and will require less effort and expenditure of energy on the way.

Back in the sixties I first saw a Japanese radio receiver which would fit in your palm. And I was utterly astounded: You turned a dial the size of a 3-kopek piece on the tiny apparatus and you could hear Delhi, Paris, and Tokyo.... At the same period I visited an exhibition of our new radio goods: The smallest radio receiver was 10 times heavier.

On the other hand, I thought, we have constructed the world's largest blast furnaces and our walking excavators have jibs that stretch out higher than the necks of prehistoric dinosaurs. We erect the world's biggest factory blocks. Sometimes so vast that a helicopter can fly under the roof.

Yes, only recently we took pride in the fact that our giant machines were digging the deepest craters -- quarries on the black soil of Kursk -- and were mining iron ore from 200 meters down. We had long ago outstripped all countries of the world in terms of ore extraction. And we were also proud of that.

Time passed and the habit of giantism, having settled in our brains like a nail driven in up to the head, persistently guided the planners' pens. Just 10 years ago they planned, and construction workers began to erect in Krasnoyarsk, a giant plant for the production of heavy excavators such as the world has not seen and will not see. [paragraph continues]

Even after the year 2000 it will produce excavators working on the basis of the principle of an ordinary shovel: "Take more and throw it further." Yet even in our country in open cast pits rotary earthmoving machines which are many times smaller in terms of mass and which are more productive have already been in operation for a long time.

An increasing number of people are now understanding why giantism used to excite us and indeed even now captivates some people. The point is that it was the expenditure mechanism of economic management, harmful and dangerous to the state's entire economy, which pushed us to create heavy and expensive machinery, enormous blast furnaces and very tall factory blocks. The essence of the meachanism is simple and comprenhensible. The heavier and more expensive the machine which is being created or the larger the new plant, then the greater the advantage to the planners and construction workers, although it was ruinous to the country.

For instance, the construction of a new giant blast furnace is estimated at R100 million. Of this 60 percent is the cost of finished metal structures received from suppliers, that is the cost of other people's labor. But the construction workers' wage fund -- 25 percent -- is deducted from the overall sum, from the R100 million. Do the construction workers have any interest in expending as little metal as possible? Of course not. They eagerly ascribe other people's labor to themselves. When you think about it, you can understand why we have, for instance, achieved record speeds in laying superlong pipelines. After all, each kilometer of steel pipe not yet placed in the ground is estimated at over R500,000. On the other hand lightweight gas field pipes through which gas is collected from boreholes have a price which is 10-12 times less. And you actually have to use force to get construction workers to lay them at gas deposits.

A very great deal that is destructive to the country lies to this day in this perfidious ruble indicator,in the desire to "assimilate" as many funds as possible. For instance, every year over 12 billion cubic meters of by-product gas -- a very valuable substance from the underground oil and gas deposits -- has been burned in flares for 10 years now. Day and night mighty columns of fire unfailingly heat the Siberian sky. Yet they could give the country billions of rubles of net revenue. It is for the same reason that by-product gas is collected only slowly from boreholes and is refined only with reluctance. There is a great deal of trouble but little in the way of "pickings" in ruble terms is given to the construction workers compared with the giant projects.

Who Is Leading the Ball? [Subhead]

Where are the roots of giant mania -- that "daughter" of the gross output indicator -- and, the main thing, how to combat extravagance? Scientists assert that we have been rather late in assessing the substantially altered avenues of industrial development in the world and in our own country. In the early seventies marked changes had already begun in the development of production forces. Many countries put their resources into the developmemt of science-intensive production facilities. The fine electronic Lady whose name -- Microminiaturization -- is hard to pronounce unless you are used to it, became the "queen of the ball" in the Palace of Technologies.

Meanwhile our social sciences adhered firmly to several dogmas which even then had lost much of their freshness. The first was that the country's steady economic development allegedly requires the all-around expansion of the base sectors and above all the extraction of raw material. Our plans proceeded persistently from this premise. As a result industry was geared to the all-around development of large-tonnage metallurgy and old, expensive technology in the cement industry. [paragraph continues]

We have constructed ever new giant factory blocks even when there was a shortage of the already obsolete equipment for them.

Another dogma was that growth rates could only be increased by building up the volumes of assimilated (expended) funds and therefore the expenditure of resources. Hence the dissipation of tens of billions of rubles on numerous construction sites and the almost universal disregard for the careful expenditure of energy, metal, cement, timber, and other material resources. Fuel is expended particularly extravagantly. After all, to this day the operation of, for instance, snow clearing convoys in some cities in assessed as a rule... by the expenditure of fuel in the tanks of the dump trucks. The more fuel combusted, the higher the transport workers' wages.

How to emerge from the prevailing situation more rapidly and prompt people to safeguard the motherland's resources annd work economically and thriftily? All of us and first of all the planners will have to fight ourselves and get out of our heads the immutable postulate that a higher end result for the functioning of production is achieved on the basis of building up the quantity of raw and semifinished materials expended and the additional construction of new factory blocks. And it is not inappropriate to do away with the dogma that the more work we do (what kind of work is unimportant!) the faster the growth rates will be. It is time to make it clear that growth in the expenditure of resources is not growth in economic development rates. It is frequently the indicator of damage caused.

Life confirms that above all it is necessary to invest money not in digging artificial craters and not in diverting great rivers but in the man who is capable of working creatively, who knows how to "genuflect" to the lady called Microminiaturization. And we must learn to trade not in raw material but in the products of human intelligence. The yield from any giant excavator declines rapidly with the years and in the course of its entire life it does not even recoup the esxpenses on its creation and repair. On the other hand the return on funds skillfully invested in the development of the individual grows with the years inasmuch as his knowledge and experience grow.

It is very advantageous to society to painstakingly train people in the art of working professionally and honestly, not out of fear but out of interest and conscientiousness. The greater a person's contribution then the higher the incentive should be (with no ceiling). And conversely he who works badly and in a slipshod way should be rewarded accordingly. That is the basic principle of socialism. Some 2 years ago the party acted in a very long-sighted way by giving priority in restructuring to the human factor.

People are bolder in their ventures when their ideas are immediately implemented in practice. The secret of the tenfold acceleration in the work of the Ivanovo machine tool builders is the full revelation of the potential of specialists and workers with the aid of moral and skillfully used material incentives and the unbounded faith in the engineers' creative capabilities.

I shall cite one more instructive example of restructuring. In Odessa there is the "Kislorodmash" association which for many years was led by the now deceased B. Ye. Trinchuk. Here engineers from the special design and technology bureau and shop technologists have been creating wonderful equipment without increasing the overall metal expenditure for two 5-year plans now. Does it then transpire that the clever economic leaders and specialists in Ivanovo and Odessa, even with the "perfidious intrigues" of the economic mechanism, havae somehow extricated themselves, have gotten and are continuing to get out of the situation? Of course it is not easy. [paragraph continues]

I remember when I asked B. Trinchuk where the main difficulty lay in his work he sighed heavily:

"Going against the turbid flow of the 'gross output' criterion. It is dragging us back, pushing us toward the overexpenditure of metal, and my conscience and that of other specialists is protesting."

Perhaps self-financing will bring victory over the gross output criterion? Let's listen to V. Moskalenko, deputy general director for economics at the Sumy Science and production association.

Seeking a "Ceiling" [subhead]

In one speech V. Moskalenko speculates: In our conversations we frequently equate three words -- financial autonomy, self-capitalization, and self-financing. Here we do not always consider where their similarity and differences lie. Yet self capitalization is only the first degree of financial autonomy. It shows that a plant is working profitably. Here the profit can be confiscated for the budget and for sectorial needs. And at the same time the state gives the plant money for new construction while the ministry has the right to confiscate depreciation funds and transfer them to another plant. This arbitrary reallocation of funds within the sector is an antistimulus. It drags up the laggards at the expense of plants which are working profitably. And as a result it discourages the former and the latter from working well.

The new, higher degree of financial autonomy is self-financing. In this case the enterprise receives sufficient profit not only to cover expenses and to deduct some of the money, on the basis of stable normatives, for the budget and ministry, but also if necessary to expand its shops, construct housing and sociocultural establishments, form funds for paying and giving incentives to people, and develop the technical standard of production.

After accounts have been settled with the budget and ministry, the remainder of the profit and the depreciation funds are allocated to the enterprise. No one has the right to confiscate them. The result is that self financing is "above" self-capitalization.

The Sumy workers have been blazing the trail into the unknown for nearly 2 years. Self-financing has been a powerful lever which is improving the association's work. This can be seen by comparing indicators before and after the introduction of self-financing. Labor productivity has risen from 10 to 13.6 percent a year and the retained [balansovaya] profit has increased from 18.4 to 32.4 percent. Before the transition the annual reduction of expenditure per ruble of output was 1.6 percent and after the transition it was 3.1 percent.

We should stop to consider the last two figures. Why with such a big increase in profit has expenditure per ruble of output declined by only 3.1 percent? Because even under self-financing the system of prices continues to be formed on the basis of dependence on the growth of expenditure. The higher the expenditure, the higher the price. That means that self-financing must be improved.

"A fundamental prices reform is extremely necessary," V. Moskalenko believes. "Price should correspond to socially necessary expenditure on the production of a particular item and depend not on individual expenditure but on articles' qualitative parameters, on the article's impact on the consumer. Then there will be an incentive to reduce expenditure."

V. Moskalenko is also convinced of the following point. Every association should know exactly its top ceiling in production, in output quality, and the reduction of the prime cost of output. This should be expressed in normatives surpassing the world standard. And the closer the result of economic management is to the normative, the better the enterprise will work. Then there will no longer be the fear of taking on a "heavy" plan.

If You Have Overspent a Resource You Must Pay [subhead]

A characteristic feature of the first postwar decades was the unusually rapid growth of the extraction and processing of mineral raw material. In the fifties through the seventies, Novosibirsk scientist P. Oldak has calculated, the world processed as much raw material as in mankind's entire preceding history. But if the extraction of raw material in the world doubled in 15 years, in our country it doubled in 8-10 years. As a result the USSR now accounts for 26 percent of the world output of the mining sectors.

The gigantic scales of raw material extraction are inexorably depleting the rich and most accessible deposits. That is why expenditure on raw material extraction is increasing sharply with every passing year. In just 10 years it has increased 100-200 percent in our country. So even a small growth here requires enormous expenditure.

It is necessary to accelerate drastically the reuse and repeated use of resources already extracted. The smelting of steel and aluminum from scrap metal saves 60 and 95 percent of energy respectively. Already over 60 million metric tons of steel are smelted from scrap metal in our country. Here over 10 billion cubic meters of gas and over 50 million metric tons of coal are saved by comparison with smelting from ore. But even that is not enough. In the GDR, for instance, 75 percent of all steel is smelted from scrap metal.

We too must understand without delay that mankind is advancing toward an economy based on "the recycling of resources." The massive scrapping of rapidly obsolete equipment and the fundamentally new waste-free, resource-saving manufacturing methods will substantially reduce the demand for primary raw material. It is not out of the question that with time the world scrap metal market "will see off" the market for iron ore of which we extract more than anyone in the world.

To reduce the demand for raw material and thus lighten the straggling carts in the convoy of the economy, we must put an anti-expenditure mechanism into operation as soon as possible. Its aim is to interest everyone -- from worker to Gosplan chairman -- in an all-round reduction in the proportionate expenditure of raw material, fuel, energy, and manpower.

One way to this is to charge for all resources: natural, manpower, and information resources. Everyone will be interested in safeguarding them. There should be just one principle: If you have used any resource you must pay for it from the earned profit. If you have produced a reliable machine with the lowest proportinote metal-intensiveness and energy-intensiveness, then you receive the maximum profit increment. Then every participant in production will have to think in earnest about the most economical methods of working.

Only on the basis of the transition to a new degree of even fuller financial autonomy and only with self financing is it possible to resolve a triple task -- ensuring the country's economic independence, implementing social programs adopted by the 27th party congress, and preserving a wholesome natural environment.

The initially seemingly immaterial comparison between a small electronic instrument and a giant mechanized shovel reflects two avenues of technological development and two outcomes. We must resolutely rid ourselves of the heavy and sticky "rest mass" and lift from the economy's shoulders the surplus and frequently useless load in order to advance at a faster pace along the difficult road of scientific and technical progress.

MINISTER OF GEOLOGY VIEWS OIL, GAS PROSPECTING

LD021232 Moscow TASS in English 1202 GMT 2 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS -- The volume of work related to prospecting for oil and gas will be increased 1.7 times in the current Soviet five-year plan period (1986-1990) as against the previous five years, Yevgeniy Kozlovsky, minister of geology of the USSR, told TASS. It is planned, in part, to launch the development of 90 oil fields.

The computer-aided complex "Razrez" which accomplishes all types of research work in prospecting holes and optimizes drilling is under development in the Soviet Union for the first time in world practice.

Much emphasis is laid on establishing an inter-sectoral scientific and technical complex, "Geos". It is an automated system of collecting and processing information obtained at four measuring levels: space-air-earth-well. Its operation will improve fundamentally the natural resources exploration technology, provide an opportunity to make an extended forecast, optimize the processes of prospecting for oil and gas fields and their preparation for exploitation.

Touching upon the results of the work to explore natural resources, the minister said that the 1986 plan for an increase in reserves of the majority of mineral resources made up not less than 20 per cent of the five-year plan. The volume of work in geological prospecting will grow by ten per cent in 1987 as against last year and the capital investments in oil and gas -- by 16 per cent, the minister said.

An appreciable growth in worker productivity is envisaged. Work is to be finalized to explore and certify the reserves of 122 deposits. The terms were cut for prospecting for a number of deposits in central Kazakhstan and the maritime region, which are crucial for the national economy.

MORE ON MILITARY EDUCATION FORUM IN KAZAKHSTAN

LD251143 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Mar 87

[Text] On 18 March a conference of the republic's party and local Soviet aktiv was held at the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee on issues relating to the military and patriotic education and training of young people for military service. Reports were delivered by Colonel General Kovtunov, commander of the Red Banner Central Asian Military District, and Yefimov, chief of the Administrative Organs Department of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee. [passage indistinct]

Speaking at the conference was Comrade Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee. Taking part in the work of the conference were Akhmetova, deputy chairman of the Kazakhstan SSR Council of Ministers; Asanbayev and [name indistinct], chiefs of departments of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee; military leaders, senior party, local soviet, trade union, and Komsomol officials; and representatives of ministries and departments.

KIEV FIELD-RANK OFFICERS DISMISSED FOR ABUSES

PM021111 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 March 1987 First Edition carries on page 2 under the headline "To Resolve the New Tasks More Boldly" a 2,000-word report by correspondent Colonel A. Polyakov on an undated party aktiv meeting in the Red Banner Kiev Military District. District Commander Colonel General V. Osipov reportedly "delivered a report on the results of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum and the tasks stemming from its decisions for commanders, political organs, and party organizations" at the meeting, which was also addressed by Lieutenant General V. Arapov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Kiev Military District Political Directorate. The report says:

"The CPSU Central Committee January Plenum sharply raised the question of work with cadres and their ideological education. Good things were said at the party aktiv meeting about communists V. Litvinov, A. Poshatalov, V. Malkov, and D. Khmura. These officers, like many others, spare no effort to fulfill their official and party duty. At the same time, there are many omissions in training and placing officer-leaders. Not so long ago Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Ovcharov was appointed the district's chief of physical training and sport. But strict party proceedings are now being instituted against him for favoritism and abuse of his official position. Communist Colonel V. Romanov reequipped an official motor vehicle earmarked for use on exercises as a private dacha to serve himself and 'honored guests.' Romanov has incurred a strict party penalty and been removed from his post.

"Among Communists there are still bureaucrats, lovers of red tape, and people who like to enjoy benefits at the state's expense, forgetting about the honor of the officer. Colonel V. Kirik, military commissar of a Kiev city rayon, gave draft deferments to sons of 'necessary' people and was mixed up in other improper affairs. He was demoted. But he did not draw the proper lesson in his new place either. And higher party organs again had to intervene and call the high-handed leader to order. All this indicates that it is necessary to study cadres better, employ openness in promoting them, and consult with communists.

"Our Armed Forces have always been noted for the strong friendship among servicemen of different nationalities and ethnic groups, by each serviceman's profound understanding of his filial duty to the motherland, and by troop comradeship. Instances of nonregulation relations among servicemen must be regarded with all the more intolerance. Here success cannot be achieved with single measures. Whereas military discipline improved somewhat in the district last year, a slump is now apparent in this important work. A rebuke was addressed from the party aktiv rostrum, above all, to the district air force political department, which is headed by Major General of Aviation V. Kobyakov, and to subunits of the construction directorate led by Colonel Yu. Ardabyev. The point is that political organs and party organizations have not drawn up a system of prophylactic, preventive measures and are not in control of the situation in subunits every hour of every day.

"The report and other speeches also touched on questions of antialcohol education. This is no easy matter. The problem cannot be solved by bans alone, by driving lovers of alochol 'underground.' Everything must be done to keep drug addiction out of the servicemen's ranks. It is necessary to diversify forms of cultural leisure, actively freshen up the activities of cultural enlightenment establishments, and be militant and assertive in antialcohol work. The struggle for a sober way of life must not be removed from the agenda."

The report concludes by stating: "The party aktiv meeting was addressed by Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. V. Kryuchkov, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and Lieutenant General N. Goncharov participated in the work of the party aktiv meeting."